DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 489 24 CG 003 885

By-Thompson, Charles Lowell

Counselors' Conceptions of Ideal and Non-Preferred Client Types. Final Report.

Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Research Foundation.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-7-E-072

Pub Date Dec 67

Grant-OEG-1-7-070072-3717

Note-133p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$6.75

Descriptors-*Counseling Effectiveness, Counseling Goals, *Counselor Acceptance, *Counselor Attitudes, Counselor Performance, *Secondary School Counselors, Student Attitudes, Student Rehabilitation

With a focus on the school counselors' conceptions of ideal and non-preferred clients, this study has attempted to examine those factors that inhibit or facilitate counseling gains. Procedures included selection of participants, personal interviews, testing (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator), analysis of subjects' grade point average, and scores from the Herman-Nelson Test of Mental Ability. Four hypotheses were submitted to statistical tests. The findings include the following: (1) Counselors' ideal and non-preferred client groups vary widely, but group differences, particularly in school adjustment and achievement, do exist which could affect counseling outcomes; (2) Difficult clients tend to be in conflict with teachers, parents, and peers; (3) Non-preferred clients tend to have emotional problems and ideal clients, vocational; and (4) Counselor-client agreement is generally significant with ideal clients. Recommendations for further study are given. (KP)

ED028489

BR 7-E-072
PA 24
OE-BR

FINAL REPORT

Grant Number OEG-1-7-070072-3717

# COUNSELORS' CONCEPTIONS OF IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENT TYPES

December, 1967

U. S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

CG003885

The Ohio State University
Research Foundation
Columbus, Ohio 43212

# COUNSELORS' CONCEPTIONS OF IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENT TYPES

Charles Lowell Thompson

The Ohio State University
Research Foundation
Columbus, Ohio

December, 1967

U. S. Department of
Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education
Washington D.C.

Grant OEG-1-7-070072-3717

# PREFACE

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (OEG-1-7-070072-3717) to The Ohio State University Research Foundation. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

This report was the dissertation of the author presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy to the Graduate School of The Ohio State University, 1967.

# CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Problem | 3 |
| | Hypotheses | 3 |
| | Importance of the Study | 4 |
| | Definitions | 6 |
| | Limitations | 7 |
| | Organization of the Remainder of the Report | 8 |
| II | REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 9 |
| | Ideal or Preferred Client Types | 9 |
| | Communication of Counselor Biases | 14 |
| | Counselor-Client Match | 19 |
| III | PROCEDURES | 25 |
| | Population | 25 |
| | Methodology | 26 |
| | Instruments | 27 |
| | Data Analysis | 29 |
| | Summary | 33 |
| IV | FINDINGS | 35 |
| V | SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 79 |
| APPENDICES | | 93 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RELATED LITERATURE | | 127 |

# LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1 Analysis of Variance for Two-Factor Experiments with Ten Observations per Cell 31

2 Mean Grade Point Averages for Each of the Ten Counselors' Two Client Groups 36

3 Analysis of Variance for the Relationship between Grade Point Average and Client Idealness 36

4 Mean Intelligence Test Scores for Each of the Ten Counselors' Two Client Groups 38

5 Analysis of Variance for the Relationship between Intelligence Test Scores and Client Idealness 38

6 Types of Curricula in Which Each of the Ten Counselors' Two Client Groups Are Enrolled 40

7 2 X 3 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Theoretical and Observed Frequencies for the Curriculum Types of Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients 40

8 Future Plans of the Clients in Each of the Ten Counselors' Two Client Groups 42

9 2 X 5 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Theoretical and Observed Frequencies for the Types of Future Plans Selected by Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients 43

10 Counselor-Client Sex Matching Effects for Each of the Ten Counselors' Two Client Types 44

11 2 X 2 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of Theoretical and Observed Frequencies for Male Counselors' Client-Sex Preference in the Ideal and Non-Preferred Client Groups 44

12 2 X 2 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of Theoretical and Observed Frequencies for Female Counselors' Client-Sex Preference in the Ideal and Non-Preferred Client Groups 46

13 2 X 2 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Theoretical and Observed Sex Difference Frequencies in the Ideal and Non-Preferred Client Groups 46

## LIST OF TABLES - continued

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 14 | Occupational Levels for the Parents of Each of the Ten Counselors' Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients and the Number of Clients' Mothers Employed Outside of the Home | 48 |
| 15 | 2 X 4 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Theoretical and Observed Frequencies of Parents' Occupational Levels for Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 49 |
| 16 | 2 X 2 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Theoretical Observed Frequencies for Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients' Mothers Employed Outside the Home and as Housewives Only | 49 |
| 17 | Problem Categories Selected by the Clients in Each of the Ten Counselors' Two Client Groups | 51 |
| 18 | 2 X 3 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Theoretical and Observed Frequencies for the Problem Categories Selected by Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 51 |
| 19 | Problem Categories Selected by Each of the Ten Counselors for Their Two Client Groups | 52 |
| 20 | 2 X 3 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Theoretical and Observed Frequencies for the Problem Categories Selected by Counselors for Their Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 52 |
| 21 | The Similarity of Counselor-Client Agreement on Problem Categories between Each of the Ten Counselors and Their Two Client Groups | 54 |
| 22 | 2 X 3 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Similarity of Counselor-Client Agreement on Problem Categories Between the Counselors and Their Two Client Groups | 55 |
| 23 | Problem Cause Categories Selected by the Clients in Each of the Ten Counselors' Two Client Groups | 55 |
| 24 | 2 X 5 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Theoretical and Observed Frequencies for the Problem Cause Categories Selected by Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 57 |
| 25 | Problem Cause Categories Selected by Each of the Ten Counselors for Their Two Client Groups | 58 |

LIST OF TABLES - continued

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 26 | 2 X 5 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Theoretical and Observed Frequencies for the Problem Cause Categories Selected by Counselors for Their Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 59 |
| 27 | The Similarity of Counselor-Client Agreement on Problem Cause Categories between Each of the Ten Counselors and Their Two Client Groups | 60 |
| 28 | 2 X 3 Contingency Table ($X^2$ Analysis) of the Similarity of Counselor-Client Agreement on Problem Cause Categories between the Counselors and Their Two Client Groups | 61 |
| 29 | A Comparison of Counselor and Client Mean Counseling Outcomes Ratings for Each of the Ten Counselors and Their Two Client Groups | 62 |
| 30 | Mann-Whitney U Test Indicating the Degree of Counseler-Client Agreement between Each of the Ten Counselors and Their Two Client Groups on Counseling Outcome Ratings | 64 |
| 31 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 1 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 66 |
| 32 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 2 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 67 |
| 33 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 3 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 68 |
| 34 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 4 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 69 |
| 35 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 5 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 70 |
| 36 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 6 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 71 |
| 37 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 7 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 72 |
| 38 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 8 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 73 |

## LIST OF TABLES - continued

| TABLE | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 39 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 9 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 74 |
| 40 | Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scores for Counselor Number 10 and His Ideal and Non-Preferred Clients | 75 |
| 41 | Analysis of Variance for Comparing Counselor-Client Similarity between Ideal and Non-Preferred Client Groups on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator's Extraversion-Introversion Scale | 76 |
| 42 | Analysis of Variance for Comparing Counselor-Client Similarity between Ideal and Non-Preferred Client Groups on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator's Sensing--Intuition Scale | 76 |
| 43 | Analysis of Variance for Comparing Counselor-Client Similarity between Ideal and Non-Preferred Client Groups on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator's Thinking-Feeling Scale | 78 |
| 44 | Analysis of Variance for Comparing Counselor-Client Similarity between Ideal and Non-Preferred Client Groups on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator's Judgment-Perception Scale | 78 |

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Conversation is viewed by most therapists and counselors as the primary medium of counseling. When a counselor and student are able to communicate effectively through the conversation medium, counseling is most likely to be successful. There is mounting evidence, however, that many students in various school settings, for reasons of background, appearance, values, and perceptual biases, are not able to communicate with the typical middle class counselor in the counselor's language (Corwin and Thomas, 1966; Strom, 1966; and Toby, 1957). The same holds true regarding the counselor's inability to communicate in these students' language. In fact, because conversation between counselors and students with divergent backgrounds and interests is so difficult, they may tend to avoid each other in a counseling situation or in any other setting where conversational activity is required. If the above is generally true and there are considerable numbers of students avoiding school conversational activities such as counseling, we have another situation adding to the alienation already experienced by students who diverge from "middleclassness." Inner city and Appalachian area students find little opportunity to identify with significant objects, events, and people in the typical middle class school (Becker, 1952, 1948; Deutsch, 1960; Haubrich, 1963; Passow, 1966; Stendler, 1949; and Warner et al., 1944). The school counselor should be at least one person with whom they can talk and work in bridging gaps in their personal and educational development. He could be for these students the one link they still have with an otherwise meaningless school experience, but only if he is able to communicate effectively with them.

Compounding communication difficulties is the lack of interest counselors may have for clients whom they find difficult to counsel. Low interest in or regard for the client as a person, coupled with corresponding low counseling outcome expectancies, seem to be factors that are quite easily perceived by these clients. Friedenberg (1959), writing on emotional development in adolescence, points out that adolescents have a keen perception about what other people are really like and are all but impossible to fool by hypocrisy. Empathy apparently stands these young people in good stead in detecting the real predispositions of others toward them.

Persons working in counseling and psychotherapy professions in agencies outside of the school setting are beginning to look more closely at the consequences and practicality involved in working with non-preferred clients. Schofield's (1964) survey of three counseling-oriented professions revealed definite biases about the type of clients preferred and not preferred for treatment. Rogers (1942) long ago constructed a list of client traits which he felt were inhibiting to his counseling effectiveness. As a result, these non-school counselors and therapists have become selective in deciding whom they will and will not counsel. They have recognized the deterimental effects and low therapy gains resulting from trying to work with non-preferred clients. That these selected or preferred clients are often quite dissimilar to the majority of people needing psychotherapy or to those generally being treated in an institutional setting is apparently of little concern to many men in private practice. They want to treat those people with whom they are most successful and those who most interest them.

School counselors, on the other hand, are expected to work effectively with all individuals in the school. They cannot directly refuse to counsel a particular non-preferred client, so one of two alternatives is selected. They may (1) attempt to see these non-preferred clients routinely and waste both their and the client's time and probably reinforce the client's already alienated feelings associated with the school; or (2) busy themselves with preferred clients and guidance duties to the point where every available moment in the day is filled.

With today's emphasis on working with "disadvantaged" youth and "specialty oriented" students who are generally considered as misfits in the typical middle class setting, it becomes necessary to examine counselors' perceptions of the types of clients with whom they feel they are most effective and hence label as preferred or ideal people to counsel. Are there, in fact, large numbers of these students who don't have an opportunity to talk to a counselor who wants to talk with them? If such is the case in the schools, as it apparently is for psychological treatment in non-school settings, efforts should be directed toward the placement of counselors in schools having the type of students with whom counselors feel they can be successful. Schools having wide diversity in their school population should consider hiring a counseling staff holding among themselves several different orientations toward ideal client types.

It is the view of this investigator that counselors are often reluctant to admit having counselee preferences because holding such a bias is not in keeping with the "good guy" role expectation of being open and accepting toward all students and their problems. Unfortunately, though, feigning openness and acceptance does not guarantee counseling success with the same high probability that effective communication of genuine interest does. Therefore, this research was directed toward the identification of school counselors' ideal and non-preferred client types to determine (1) if school counselors hold systematized biases regarding ideal and non-preferred client types and, if so, to determine proportionately how many students lack the opportunity of talking with a counselor who prefers them as clients; (2) the nature of ideal and non-preferred clients and the effects differences between the two types might have on counseling outcomes; (3) whether or not a relationship exists between client idealness and counselor-client personality similarity; and (4) whether or not a relationship exists between client idealness and counselor-client agreement on the counselor's counseling effectiveness.

## Problem

Recent research in counseling-oriented professions has indicated that counselors and therapists do hold concepts of ideal clients with whom they prefer to work and are most effective. School counselors, on the other hand, are expected to be effective with all client types in the schools where they are employed. Such expectations may be unrealistic because (1) counselors may arrange their work schedules in such a manner as to see only those students who fit their ideal client type; and (2) counselors are just as human as other therapists who cannot be effective with every client type. Therefore, the focus of this study was on identifying commonalities that might exist among counselors' successful and unsuccessful clients for the purpose of investigating whether or not school counselors have generalized conceptions of ideal and non-preferred client types with whom they prefer to work and not to work and also with whom they are most and least successful.

## Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that:

(1) School counselors have stereotyped clients with whom they prefer and prefer not to counsel and that these two client types will differ significantly in the following areas:

   (a) grade point average
   (b) intelligence test scores
   (c) curriculum
   (d) future educational or training plans
   (e) sex
   (f) parents' occupational classification
   (g) agreement with their counselor on the nature of the problem: vocational, educational, and/or emotional
   (h) agreement with their counselor on the cause of the problem: lack of information about self, lack of information about the environment, conflict within self, conflict with significant others, and lack of skill
   (i) problem type (see above in (g)
   (j) problem cause (see above in (h)

(2) Counselor and client agreement on ratings of counseling outcome success will be a function of the degree to which the client approaches the counselor's concept of an ideal client.

(3) Ideal clients will view counseling as helpful while non-preferred clients will see it as being not helpful.

(4) Ideal client types will tend to manifest personality characteristics on the Myers-Biggs Type Indicator that are more similar to those of their counselors than will non-preferred client types.

When the above hypotheses were submitted to statistical tests, the null hypothesis was employed. The hypothetical statement to be tested then read: the difference between the two client groups as stated in hypotheses 1, 2, 3, and 4 is equal to zero.

## Importance of the Study

Research focusing on the identification of possible school counselor biases toward ideal and non-preferred client types should assist in ascertaining the relationship between an effective counseling service and the relative number of ideal and non-preferred clients to be served. Data of this nature are especially needed if counseling with "disadvantaged" students is to be more than a perfunctory task. Are there, in fact, large numbers of various student types who have limited opportunity to talk with a counselor who considers them ideal or preferred type counseling cases? If the ratio of non-preferred to ideal clients is disproportionate this factor would have implications for present methods of selection, training, and placement of school counselors. Are we selecting for counselor preparation, people from a rather narrow middle-class background and interest range who prefer to counsel only those students with personalities similar to theirs? Do our counselor education programs offer sufficient depth to allow trainees to work with a wide variety of clients so that they may determine those client types with whom they work best? And finally, do elementary and secondary school placement officials consider a counselor's client preference when assigning him to a particular neighborhood school?

The significance of this research lies in the fact that it may indicate client preferences among school counselors and thereby make counselor client preference a significant factor in staffing school counseling positions. Directors of pupil personnel services could be aided in their placement of counselors if a more objective method existed for determining a counselor's ideal client. Likewise, school counselors might make better selections of the areas and school systems in which they would be more effective if they have some self-knowledge about their biases. For example, the counselor suited to work with college oriented students from "higher" socio-economic backgrounds would probably be quite ineffective in "culturally disadvantaged" areas where college and academic motivation is comparatively low.

Counselors working together in a particular school often tend to divide their counseling load by grade levels or by sex. Being cognizant of preferred clients, these counselors might better direct most of their attentions to those students whom they like and with whom they expect to be more successful. Naturally, a counselor cannot expect to find himself in a situation where he will be counseling clients who are all likeable. However, by increasing his self-knowledge of his biases, the counselor could conceivably further his effectiveness with non-preferred clients by being honest and genuine in discussing his feelings with them. The investigator is reminded of an experience when he was counseling a client who had a special talent for boring him. When confronted with the counselor's actual feelings about the session, counseling suddenly became productive after the client remarked that he guessed he must affect many people in the same way.

The primary benefit to counselors from this research might then be this awakening of awareness to personal biases about their clients and consequent effects on counseling stemming from these expectancies. The counselor's increased self-awareness should serve to help control his status as one of the variables in the situation to which the client is responding. Acceptance of these recognized biases without guilt feelings should increase counselors' levels of congruity in counseling situations. Pepinsky's (1963) writings about research on the convergence phenomenon in psychological treatment focus on counselor bias effects. He points out that if convergence is to occur and if treatment is to be effective, the therapist will need to hold the firmly implanted and systematized bias that the client can benefit from this experience. In a similar vein is Frank's (1961) theory of persuasive healing which holds that effective treatment occurs when the "healer" is able to transmit to the "sufferer" at least some expectancy of recovery.

Once again, this study has significance for both the selection and training of counselors. We need to know if counselors are being selected from a too narrow range of backgrounds and if training programs are geared to give trainees a sufficiently wide breadth of experience in counseling all types of youth. Counselors have been accused of being too theoretically oriented and of not being able to work effectively with "inner city" and non-college bound youth. Do counselors have preferred client types from these two groups of students, or are these students left out of the school counseling picture? The central purpose of the study, then, was to ascertain what types of clients, if any, are preferred by school counselors and how these preferred clients differ from non-preferred clients.

## Definitions

Three concepts central to the study are defined as they were used in the research design. Their definitions are more fully developed in the literature review in Chapter II.

Ideal Client: This is a client designated by his counselor as one with whom he has experienced a high degree of success in counseling. This client is one with whom the counselor prefers to work because they function well together in the counseling situation. Generally these ideal client types stimulate the counselor in such a manner that he functions best when working with them and consequently holds positive counseling outcome expectations which are communicated to these clients. Ideal clients are people whom psychotherapists and counselors find most likeable and most interesting; these favorable attitudes along with the positive outcome expectancies are also communicated to clients, again facilitating the achievement of counseling gains.

Non-preferred Client: This is a client who, in the opinion of his counselor, fails to have any of the qualities his counterpart, the ideal client, has. It would be possible for one client type to be ideal for one counselor while being a non-preferred client for another, although research on teacher student preference and on client preference for non-school counselors would seem to indicate otherwise (see Chapter II).

The non-preferred client in this study is the client designated by his counselor as one with whom he had little success. Generally, the counselor and his non-preferred client types diverge widely in their interests, personality, and background so that it is difficult for either to identify with the other's situation. Consequently, the counselor has for these non-preferred client types low expectations for their improvement via counseling coupled with a lack of interest in them as individuals. As in the case of the ideal client, counselor expectancies and feelings are communicated to the non-preferred client resulting in the attainment of little or no counseling success.

Counseling success: This was defined in this study according to the perceptions of each of the ten (10) participating counselors and their respective criteria for counseling success. Counselors listed for inclusion in the study their twelve (12) most successful counseling cases and their twelve (12) least successful counseling cases. Criteria for success and failure that were listed are presented in Appendix F. Some examples of counseling success criteria were: (1) The client gained self-confidence as manifested in more participation in classroom discussions; (2) The client improved study skills (grades have improved); and (3) The client seemed to show a more realistic attitude toward future plans.

Some examples of criteria for counseling failure included: (1) The client still is unable to resolve conflicts with teachers; (2) The client's work continues to be a classic example of under achievement; and (3) The client has made little noticeable progress in learning how to make his own decisions.

Degree of counseling success was rated by both the counselor and their students on a scale ranging from 1 to 9. The numbers 1, 2, and 3 were designated as low ratings for counseling success (on the counselor's interview form) or helpfulness (on the client's interview form). The numbers 4, 5, and 6 designated medium success and the numbers 7, 8, and 9, high success. (See Appendices: A and B.)

## Limitations

The study was necessarily limited to five high schools in Columbus, Ohio, which had student populations approaching normal distribution. One high school also housed a junior high school at the time of the study. Each school had proportionate numbers of students in the three broad curriculum areas of college preparation, vocational education, and general education. No school population in the study was slanted toward any one of these three curriculum areas. For this reason, generalizability of the findings to those schools having student populations heavily weighted in any one of the three curriculum areas may be limited because client type variety would be restricted.

At the time of the study, the Columbus systems operated on the neighborhood school principle which prevented inclusion in the study of those schools located in areas that were either predominantly higher or lower middle class. Schools located in the higher socio-ecomonic level neighborhoods prepared most of their students for college, while the reverse is true in neighborhoods of lower socio-economic status where students are mostly enrolled in general programs (regular or modified) and vocational curriculums. However, Columbus differs somewhat from other large cities in that neighborhoods served by many of their schools (including the five used in the study) have a rather heterogeneous composition. The five schools studied did have student populations representing a wide range of socio-economic levels. Many of their students come from higher middle class families, while others come from families living in poverty target areas.

The study was limited to one male and one female counselor in each of the five selected schools. Each of the ten counselors was certificated and employed as a full-time counselor.

The study was also limited to two-hundred students. Forty students from each high school were selected by having each counselor submit a list of his twelve most successful and twelve least successful clients (two of the twelve clients in each list were alternates).

A very limiting factor in the study is the restriction placed on the counselor's conception of client idealness to only those clients they perceive as experiencing a high degree of counseling success. The same limitation applies to the concept of the non-preferred client when it is restricted to counselor perception of counseling failure. The investigator felt that the above limitation was both justified and necessary, because two unpublished pilot studies conducted by him indicated that school counselors are generally reluctant to respond to instruments similar to Schofield's (1964) which require them to deal directly with their client biases. Therefore, for purpose of the study, the assumption was made that counselors operate with motives similar to those of most people and consequently prefer to do those things which they do best. It should follow that their ideal client types would be those students with whom they experience the most counseling success. It would seem that only a counselor with masochistic leanings could prefer to counsel a client through interview after interview without experiencing at least some degree of success.

## Organization of the Remainder of the Report

Chapter I has included an introduction to the study, a statement of the problem, the hypotheses to be tested, a rationale for the study, definitions of terms, and limitations. A review of literature related to the study is presented in Chapter II. The procedure and methodology utilized in the study are described in Chapter III. The findings are presented and discussed in Chapter IV followed by the summary, conclusions, and recommendations in Chapter V.

# CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents a literature review of writing and research relating to the study of counselors' conceptions of ideal and non-preferred client types. The review consists of three major areas: (1) ideal or preferred client types; (2) communication of counselor biases; and (3) counselor-client match.

Studies and articles presented in any one of the above three topic areas may have relevance for either one or both of the other topics because all three areas are involved in the formulation and communication of counselor biases.

### Ideal or Preferred Client Types

Many of the individuals in the counseling professions are beginning to give increasing attention to the importance of client idealness to counseling outcome and client continuance in counseling. Rogers (1942, 1951, 1962) has often mentioned client types and interview conditions requisite for his particular brand of therapy. Rogers feels that the counselor must really prize the client as a person and like and respect him in an unconditional manner for counseling to be successful. If the client does not approximate the counselor's preferred model and hence commands little genuine positive regard from the counselor, the counselor may feign acceptance of the client and in the process destroy the Rogerian tenant of counselor congruence (when the counselor is what he is). Some client traits listed by Rogers as non-preferred included: too young, too old, too dull, and too unstable. He also prefers not to use his approach with people having a problem situation arising from an environmental etiology. (An example could be a problem arising from an inadequate school curriculum.)

Truax et al. (1966) attempted to study some of Rogers' tenets in a cross-validation study of the relationship between therapist empathy, genuineness, and warmth to patient improvement or deterioration. Each of four therapists was given 10 patients, two unattractive role-induction patients, three attractive non-role-induction patients, two unattractive role-induction patients, and two unattractive non-role-induction patients. The attractiveness dimension was based on age, education, general appearance, psychopathology, warmth, and ability to relate easily to others. The role-induction patients were given an orientation to therapy prior to beginning treatment. Therapeutic conditions were assessed by student raters on Truax's scales of empathy, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness. Patient outcome was evaluated by a series of patient, therapist, and interviewer scales. The results indicated that the three conditions in combination were highly related to positive patient outcome and that empathy and genuineness exerted separate effects on positive patient outcome. Therapists providing high conditions had 90% improvement while those providing lower conditions had 50% improvement.

van der Veen (1967) also examined the effects of the level of therapist conditions (congruence, empathic understanding, and positive regard) on client process behavior and on case outcome. Client process behavior was defined as the patient's manner of problem expression, his depth of personal exploration, and his manner of relating to the therapist. The study was conducted with 15 hospitalized schizophrenic therapy cases and 10 therapists. While the therapists varied considerably in their experience and orientation, they generally tended to follow a client-centered type of approach to treatment. Using a variety of outcome measures and process ratings, van der Veen found that patient process movement over therapy was neither related to level of therapist conditions nor to case outcome. However, level of therapist conditions and level of patient process behavior were found to be positively related to case outcome and to the patients' perceptions of therapist conditions. It was concluded that when the therapist is perceived by both the patient and himself as being genuine, empathic, and acceptant, then both behave in ways that lead to the patient's willingness to explore his problems in depth which, in turn, facilitates the attainment of therapy goals. van der Veen raises the question of what we can do for those people who are unable to perceive positive interpersonal attitudes and consequently hesitate to engage in depth exploration of their problem situation in a counseling or psychotherapy relationship.

Additional support for Rogers' viewpoint is found in a study conducted by Feifel and Eells (1963). They analyzed the perceptions of both patients and their psychotherapists at the close of therapy as to changes taking place and ideas about what was helpful and not helpful. Patient responses strongly indicated the importance of sharing uncertainties and urgencies with an individual who will listen with respect and treat them with dignity. Therapist patient attitude proved in this study to be a consequential ingredient accounting for change.

Truax (1966) indicates further his general agreement with Rogers in a review of his own and several other counseling research studies. He points out that relatively high levels of accurate empathic understanding, non-posessive warmth, and genuineness (or lack of professional phoniness) are necessary for positive therapeutic outcomes. Lack of these factors are cited as a cause of patient deterioration. Also implied is the fact that these conditions cannot be provided in adequate measure by all counselors for all clients.

Schofield (1964), noting that psychotherapists tend to be selective in choosing their case loads, surveyed psychiatrists, psychiatric social workers, and clinical psychologists in an attempt to identify preferred and non-preferred client types. He found that all three groups preferred to restrict their efforts to clients presenting the "Yavis" syndrome (clients who are youthful, attractive, verbal, intelligent, and sensitive). All three groups tended to prefer, by a slight margin, females between the ages of 20-40. The social workers and psychiatrists preferred that the females be married, while the psychologists did not differentiate between married and single status. Psychologists and psychiatrists both indicated that some post-high-school education or undergraduate degree was desirable, but they tend to reject those with graduate or "too much" education.

Traits associated with non-preferred clients included: extreme youth (under 15) or age (over 50); a widowed or divorced status; limited education (less than high school); and, finally, employment in service, agriculture, fishery, forestry, and semi-skilled and unskilled types of occupations. Schofield's survey definitely points out the apparent fact that potentially diverse sources of therapeutic conversation are available only to a very small portion of those people needing counseling services. These three groups of therapists are not only unable to communicate with non-preferred clients, but they also share very little in the way of common interests, concerns, and background with these people.

The findings of Meyers and Schaffer (1954) and Hollingshead and Redlich (1958) indicate that patients from lower socioeconomic strata are noticeably absent from psychiatric outpatient clinics. This factor could be attributed to several institutional characteristics which militate toward screening these people out of treatment. A more plausible reason for their absence would seem to be the gulf existing between the worlds of upper middle class therapists and lower socioeconomic level patients which is sufficiently wide to prevent inclusion of these patients into therapists' select groups of ideal or preferred patient types. These people are not only considered as non-preferred patient types, but also as "unsuitable" for psychotherapy because they have so little in common with most highly trained people presently practicing psychotherapy.

Stoler (1963), examining the concept of client likeability, based his research on the idea that less successful clients may be the people who are much more difficult to like and that degree of client likeability may be related to the less successful therapy outcomes. His study investigated the rateableness of client likeability and its relationship to success in psychotherapy. Client likeability was rated by ten raters for ten clients from two recorded segments taken from each of the client's tapes. The clients had been classified into more successful and less successful categories prior to this study. Client likeability was reliably rated by the ten raters, with the more successful clients being liked significantly more than the less successful clients. The study suffers somewhat from limited sampling and differences in client knowledge existing among the raters. Apparently, the better knowledge raters have of a client, the better are their chances of attaining inter-rater reliability on the degree of client likeability.

Abeles (1964) studied client likeability and its relationship to therapist personality and empathic understanding. He found that there was an inverse relationship existing between accuracy of form perception (of the therapist) and liking clients. One implication from the results of this study is that therapists who like rather unlikeable clients set aside a certain amount of perceptual accuracy in order to facilitate therapeutic movement. If this interaction does in fact occur, such a finding would contradict the evidence supporting a need for well-developed congruence and acuity in counselors.

Mills and Abeles (1965) looked at the relationship between "liking for clients" and the degree of counselor need for nurturance and affliation. Such a relationship was found only for the most inexperienced counselors. Apparently, experienced counselors in the study were aware of the consequences of allowing personal needs to dominate the counseling relationship.

Wallach and Strupp (1960) treat the concept of ideal client in the framework of therapists' expectancies. Reviewing a series of their research findings they concluded that therapists approach each initial interview with individual sets of needs and expectancies deriving from their own life histories. If these expectations are congruent with the actual interview situation, they will consider the experiences rewarding and in turn develop warm attitudes toward the patient. The same phenomenon undoubtedly happens in regard to client expectations about the counselor and the counseling situation. Generalizing to the school counselor's situation it can be postulated that the closer the client approximates the counselor's conception of an ideal client, the better are the chances he will develop favorable attitudes toward this client. While client idealness undoubtedly differs among counselors, it might be implied that idealness results from a certain congruence existing between the kind of help the client is seeking and the kind of help the counselor is able to provide. The two following studies support these conclusions.

In the first study, conducted by Strupp (1958), psychologists and psychiatrists were asked to react as vicarious interviewees to a filmed interview. The subjects were than asked to record their own choice of responses during 28 thirty-second pauses at pre-selected points on the films. A comprehensive diagnostic questionnaire on the patient was completed following the film showing. Therapists having unfavorable outcome expectancies for the patient gave more than four times as many cold responses as did favorable prognosticators.

The second study (Strupp and Williams, 1960) consisted of having two psychiatrists conduct independent interviews with 22 patients followed by their ratings of the patients on a variety of personality and therapy-relevant dimensions. It was noted that five rating scales intercorrelated very highly: (1) degree of improvement expected, (2) capacity for insight, (3) defensiveness (negative correlation), (4) motivation for therapy, and (5) liking for the patient as a person. Apparently, patient idealness and likeability are predominant influences on the therapist's expectancy for outcome success. Furthermore, it appears that therapists holding expectancies for low-outcome success are going to do their best to fulfill their expectations.

Heller, Myers, and Kline (1963) utilized a more sophisticated research technique in a study relating to preferred and non-preferred client effects on the counselor. They controlled the client's status as one of the variables in the interview situation by employing coached clients. The findings indicated that client behavior had a marked influence on the interviewers' behavior. Hostile clients evoked hostility from the interviewer and friendly client behavior evoked friendly interviewer behavior. Dominant client behavior evoked dependent interviewer behavior and vice versa. The reciprocal effect holds the implication that certain client types will tend to evoke a consultant type of counselor behavior and that "undesirable" clients might evoke corresponding undesirable behavior from the counselor.

Eells (1964) researched the problem of whether or not therapists or a Veterans Administration clinic were homogeneous with regard to the views concerning the kind of patients who should be accepted for therapy and whether there is a relationship between the types of patients accepted and therapists' concepts of ideal or preferred patients. Utilizing the Q-sort technique, the therapists were asked to sort 60 short patient descriptions first on the basis of who should be selected for treatment, and second on the basis of personal preference. The results indicated that training and background were important factors in selection of patients. For some therapists there was considerable agreement between desire to treat a patient and the therapists' views on preferred patient types, while for others agreement was negligible. These results support the view that a well-developed systematized client bias may emerge only after careful consideration of one's counseling effectiveness with several types of individuals and cases.

Gliedman et al. (1957), in an attempt to discover why patients drop out of psychotherapy, asked 91 outpatients in their initial interviews their reasons for seeking treatment. These reasons were classified according to whether they were congruent or non-congruent with generally accepted reasons for seeking psychotherapy. It was hypothesized that remainers (four or more sessions) would express more congruent motives for seeking treatment than non-remainers (fewer than four sessions). No relationship was found between initial interview expressions of incentive for treatment and continuance in therapy.

Since 28 of the 91 patients did not remain in therapy, the authors concluded that more important to continuance in therapy than generalized congruence of incentives for treatment is the degree to which a particular patient approximates the therapist's concept of a good patient.

In a similar study by Heine and Trosman (1960), patients and therapists were both assessed on their expectations for psychotherapy. Those patients who continued in therapy felt that (1) they should have an opportunity to talk freely about themselves, (2) they should be partly responsible for the outcome, and (3) the therapist alone was not responsible for removing their discomfort through some type of interpersonal manipulation. In other words, these remainers had the set of expectancies that was being rewarded with therapist interest and attention while the non-remainers had other expectancy sets which were in fact rejected by their therapist even though as many non-remainers as remainers had anticipated positive outcomes. The non-remainers' big mistake, apparently, was in finding a therapist who didn't prefer to treat them.

Wolberg (1954), in looking at several possible factors to be considered in developing a patient's prognosis, suggest that such indices as age, intelligence levels, severity of symptoms, etc. have a lesser influence on treatment outcomes than does the therapist. He writes that placing the therapist in a prognostic index may seem unusual, but that accurate prediction of future happenings in treatment have to be based on the therapist's capacity to understand the patient, his ability to build a meaningful relationship with him, and his attitudes toward the patient. Wolberg also states that these factors should be considered for each therapist-patient dyad, because the therapist may be able to relate better to some patient types than to others.

The Snyders (1961) concur with Wolberg's statement on therapists' preference for a particular patient type. They state that counselor or therapist preference for certain client types has long been well known. They point out as examples Freud's preference for female hysterics, Hartwell's for adolescent boys, Sullivan's for schizophrenics, and Rosen's for catatonics. They also raise the point that client preference should be carefully considered when therapists select their cases.

## Communication of Counselor Biases

Fiedler's (1950, 1952, 1953) research considers the importance of the therapist's attitudes and biases to therapy. He posits that the therapist's attitudes serve either to inhibit or enhance the patient's expression of feeling and that favorable feelings by the therapist toward his patient are necessary for favorable therapy outcome. Fielder s studied patient and therapist groups for whom he had relationship index profiles (for patients) and feeling reaction patterns (for therapists).

When he divided therapists into groups having favorable and unfavorable attitudes toward their patients and then divided the patient group on the basis of high and low feeling expression, a four-fold table resulted, showing that not one of the patients whose therapist fell into the low group was in the high group. Fiedler also noted that patients of a particular therapist tend to have relationship scores similar to each others. Such a finding suggests that therapists are either selecting a preferred or ideal patient type for treatment or they are implanting the same biases in all of their patients causing them to react similarly on the relationship index. A third possibility could be that both events are contributing to homogeneity among a particular therapist's patients. In any case, Fiedler's research indicates that a patient will not freely express his feelings with a therapist who doesn't hold favorable attitudes toward him and it follows that the therapist's attitudes, favorable or not, will be communicated to the patient.

In the school counselor's situation, masking of true feelings about a client is quite difficult. Friedenberg (1959) and others point out that young people are quite perceptive in finding out what people are really like and that hypocrisy and phony cover-ups generally don't fool them for long. Students seem to possess an extra sense of empathy for detecting the real dispositions of others toward them. Therefore, if a school counselor dislikes a particular client type, he would do well to refer these people to one of his colleagues who is able to work well with them. The last thing for the counselor to do would be to attempt to portray a genuine interest in a client he finds unlikeable.

Importance of attitude in interpersonal relationships has also been noted in the classroom. Rocchio and Kearney (1956) tested 395 secondary school teachers with the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Scale and them compared their scores with their individual student failure rates. The results indicated that teachers who hold "undesirable" teacher-pupil attitudes and who stress subject matter at the expense of creating classroom atmospheres of fear and tension have the highest failure rates. Conversely, teachers who think in terms of what pupils need, feel, and know and who are able to communicate these thoughts to the students have the lowest failure rates. Teachers, by communicating their genuine interest in students as individuals, apparently facilitate achievement of higher levels of academic success.

Thompson and Peters (1966) point out the necessity of genuine counselor interest in the client if counseling is to be effective in the school situation. They defined counselor interest as being an active concern about what happens to the client as a person. They also write that genuine interest or lack of it will be communicated to the client and that counseling outcomes will be affected accordingly. A concluding statement mentions that counselors, as do other persons, prefer to work with some individuals more than others and that this factor should be considered for its effect on counseling each client.

Tyler (1961) describes how sincere client interest or its antithesis, simulated interest, is communicated by the counselor. She feels that verbal expressions by a counselor may not be as important in communicating his real opinions as are his non-verbal behaviors of promptness in meeting appointments, facial expressions, posture, and sensitivity to client feeling.

Similar findings have been noted in higher education. Heath (1964) made a significant counseling outcome study in this area. Supported by a Carnegie Corporation Grant, he counseled 36 Princeton men individually once a week during their four years of college. Heath's group when compared to a matched, non-counseled Princeton group proved to be superior in several categories of academic achievements and extracurricular activities. Vital to this study seems to be the factor of interest that was communicated in the counseling interviews. Riesman (1964) felt that the "Hawthrone effect" was operating in Heath's study where workers tended to improve or function at higher levels when they perceived someone as showing interest, listening, or paying more than usual attention to them. Implications for studying the ideal client concept are inherent in Heath's study inasmuch as his clients were all rather ideal to him. Heath, being a former Princeton student, apparently found it easy to be empathic with his clients and their situations.

Rather outstanding examples of how biases and expectancies are both influential and communicated may be found in Rosenthal et al. (1960) research on experimental bias. Three studies were made in which two groups of experimenters were asked to interview subjects on how they rated a series of standardized photographs for levels of motivation depicted in the pictures. All photographs had been rated prior to the study as depicting average motivational levels. One group of experimenters was told to expect high ratings, and the other was told to expect low ratings from their subjects. In spite of the fact that both groups of investigators read identical directions the subjects rated the photographs according to the experimenters' expectations. The above results tended to hold true when the experimenters read the directions from behind a screen and even when they passed out written instructions while remaining in full view of the subjects. Apparently, reading of directions was only partly responsible for communicating the experimenter's bias in these experiments. Possibly most of these biases were communicated through reinforcing activities of the experimenter following each of the subject's responses. Studies on the communication of biases hold much relevance for the school counselor who has many verbal and non-verbal reinforcement tools available for his use or misuse.

Many writers in the counseling field feel that successful counseling depends to a large extent on how well the counselor is able to communicate an expectancy of outcome success to the client. An example would be Pepinsky's (1963) writings on the convergence phenomena in psychological treatment which focus on counselor bias effects. He posits that if convergence between counselor and client is to occur and if treatment is to be effective, the therapist will need to hold the firmly implanted and systematized bias that the client can benefit from this experience. Proceeding in a similar vein is Frank's (1961) theory of persuasive healing which holds that effective treatment occurs when the healer is able to transmit to the sufferer some expectancy of recovery.

Kahn and Cannell's (1957) research sheds additional light on the communication of biases and expectancies. They found the main source of transference in the interviewing process to be soliciting by the interviewer. He usually does this unintentionally in attempting to gain support from the interviewee for his personal beliefs and attitudes. Apparently soliciting is not always conducted through biased questioning, but often by the way an interviewer dresses and impresses the interviewee. Kahn and Cannell used their findings to explain why middle class and working class interviewers got different responses to the same questions asked of working class people.

Sullivan's (1953) concept of parataxic distortion has relevance for the counselor regarding the soliciting of client support. Middle class counselors holding ideal client biases may erroneously over-generalize from their counseling experiences with middle class students when counseling so called "disadvantaged" students, because in reality this latter group probably responds differently and more authentically to an adult of their own socioeconomic level.

In a communication study by Heller et al. (1966), it was found that interviewer behavior had rather startling effects on the students participating in the study. They attempted to examine the effects of five types of interviewer behavior on subjects responding to a taped narrative of a student discussing his problems. The five behavior types were active-friendly, active-hostile, passive-hostile, active-hostile, and silent. Friendly interviewers proved to be the best liked, but consistent with the findings from verbal conditioning studies was the fact that active interviewers were most successful in sustaining verbalization rates of their subjects and that silent interviewers produced the least subject talk time.

Goldstein (1960) divided a group of 15 clients who had completed 15 sessions of psychotherapy into those who felt they were improving their problem situation (n=11) and those who felt that their problem had intensified (n=4). The prognostic outcome expectations of their therapists were then compared for difference in positive outcome expectancies. Therapists of the improved clients had predicted significantly more client improvement than did the therapists of the unimproved group. The results of this study lend some support to the belief that therapist biases are indeed communicated to the client, and such a phenomenon probably occurs between school counselors and their clients. This study, of course, suffers from limited sampling and needs to be replicated in different counseling centers with a larger number of clients.

Goldstein (1962) summarized several studies, including his own 1960 study, which indicates that client improvement is a function of the therapist's prognostic expectations rather than of the accuracy of his prognosis. He points out that therapist expectations are communicated to the client and influence interview conditions in such a way as to affect client improvement. Goldstein posits that in a case conference of 20 therapists, if 19 out of the 20 felt a certain patient would improve and if the one therapist holding the dissenting opinion were assigned to the patient, his low expectations for improvement would be communicated to the patient and have a hindering effect on treatment outcome, in spite of the fact that 95% of the therapists felt that the patient could get better.

Another study (Goldstein and Shipman, 1961) on communication of therapist bias was conducted with a group of senior medical students who had varying individual opinions on the value of psychotherapy. It was hypothesized that the therapists holding attitudes toward the value of psychiatry and psychotherapy would be more successful in bringing about initial interview symptom reduction in patients than would those therapists holding unfavorable attitudes toward therapy. The results of the study confirmed the hypothesis. It may be implied from the study that counselors must really believe counseling works if they are to be effective with their clients. Counselors with lukewarm convictions about the value of counseling may also get lukewarm results.

Waskow (1963) studied the effects of communicated counselor attitudes on client behavior. She hypothesized that a close relationship exists between counselor attitudes (of acceptance, interest, non-judgmentalness, and expressiveness) and client discussion and expression of feelings. The findings, however, indicated that the relationship is in an opposite direction to the prediction with judgmentalness being found to be most closely related to client discussion of feelings. Counselor interest did approach significance in being related to client expression of feeling. The research suffers somewhat by lack of a reliable method for measuring client expression of feelings as well as counselor attitudes. There is also some indication that client expression of feeling might not necessarily be related to positive counseling outcomes.

Bugental (1964) supports the view that counselor genuineness is a critical factor in the counseling process. He lists among his characteristics of the maturing therapist the existential willingness to "be there" with his client and to be authentic in his own person with this person. In fact, he goes on to mention Jourard's authenticity model of the therapist as being one of the main things having a curative effect in the therapeutic relationship in that the client is encouraged to be more open and authentic by following the therapist's example. The implication for the counselor seems to be that rather than being phony and attempting to mask real feelings toward a particular non-preferred client, it would be better to discuss these feelings honestly with the client. It might be that he affects many others in the same way he affects the counselor and that counseling directed toward his interpersonal relationships may benefit him most.

In an attempt to bridge obvious communication, interest, and identification gaps existing between therapists and non-preferred clients, Reiff (1966) utilized the "indigenous non-professional" person in his neighborhood service center in the Bronx. The need to train neighborhood people as community mental health workers became apparent when professionals began to admit that definite communication barriers exist between Ph.D's and grade school dropouts and that poverty area centers employing only highly trained professionals were not the places receiving requests for services. Two problems seem to exist when an upper middle class therapist or counselor attempts to talk with a person from "identified" poverty areas. First, the therapist or counselor may not be interested in working with this type of individual; and second, if interest is forthcoming, it probably won't be perceived by this client.

Drews (1964) reports of a project in South Dakota which supports the views of Reiff and Schofield. She writes that some school dropouts employed as aids in mental health institutions were observed to have developed warm relationships with some of the patients. These aids were given some short-term instruction in conversation and listening and then returned to the institution as group leaders for discussions on non-threatening, but interesting subjects. Clinic supervisors were surprised to find that patient improvement moved faster in these sessions than it did in conventional psychotherapy; however, when one views the language and interest barriers existing between highly trained therapists and many patients the fact becomes more plausible. Drews concludes that human understanding, communication, and interest provide for the patient a bridge back to a safer and more desirable outside world.

Schofield (1964) supports the type of program Reiff is operating in his community centers as well as those similar to Drews' description. He feels that several types of people can be trained to carry on therapeutic conversation. These people, sharing many common concerns with their clients, could help alleviate some community mental health problems. Clinical psychologists could make more efficient use of their limited time and number by functioning as consultants to these non-professional workers.

## Counselor-Client Match

Studies on counselor-client match frequently utilize such criteria for matching as remaining in therapy, leaving therapy, seeking counseling, and duration of counseling.

McNair et al. (1963), in an attempt to identify patient and therapist influences on quitting psychotherapy found that therapists with marked interest in patients' problems held significantly higher proportions of both predicted terminators and remainers in treatment. Predicted terminators tend to have many of the traits of culturally disadvantaged youth: poorly developed verbal behavior, little formal education, unwillingness to admit to anxiety, impulsivity, anti-social behavior, and few close interpersonal relationships. Another finding pointed out subgroups of therapists who somehow select high proportions of "quitters" or "stayers" as their therapy patients. These therapists are quite successful in retaining this (their preferred) type of patient in treatment, whereas the non-preferred type patient responded to these therapists about as would be predicted from the terminator-remainer criteria. Apparently, different groups of therapists respond differently to the two types of patients rather than the converse, and successful therapist-patient interaction takes place when therapists can select their patients for therapy.

In a study of client-counselor similarity, Mendelsohn and Geller (1965) used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to assess the similarity dimension and then compared similarity with clients' post-counseling evaluation of the counseling experience. Three clusters were identified from the evaluation questionnaire: (1) evaluation, (2) comfort-rapport, and (3) judged counselor competence. Evaluation was found to have a curvilinear relationship to personality similarity, with middle personality similarity producing highest evaluations. Comfort-Rapport was related to high personality similarity for freshmen, but to middle personality similarity for non-freshmen. The effects of similarity tend to be more pronounced in opposite than in same-sex pairings. High ratings of judged competence tend to be more associated with the test dimensions of introverted and thinking types than with high degrees of similarity.

Studies in personality similarity seem to indicate that similarity leads to the greatest attraction in brief two-person contacts. The effect of similarity on outcome clearly varies with the criterion used. It is linear with duration, curvilinear with evaluation, unrelated to judged competence, and, depending on the sample, both linear and curvilinear with Comfort-Rapport. Differing outcome criteria and samples seem to account for much of the inconsistency in the results of studies using similarity as a variable.

Mendelsohn (1966), in another study, examined the effects of client personality and client-counselor personality similarity on the seeking and duration of counseling. The client-counselor similarity dimension was obtained from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Comparing clients with non-clients, and quitters with remainers it was found that client personality is a significant factor in the decision to seek counseling, but that client-counselor personality match is a more important determinant of its outcome. Some contrary evidence was published earlier by Snyder (1961) who found no relationship in counseling outcomes that could be attributed to client-counselor personality similarity.

Mendelsohn concluded from his study that, compared to clients, non-clients seem to be less like both the counselor and an image of the ideal client in personality. The ideal client refers to that client who sought counseling and returned for additional interviews. These ideal clients tended to score high on the intuition and perception measures of the MBTI and have a preference for intellectual and theoretical approaches to problem solving. They also have a talent for manipulating verbal concepts and are interested in habitual self-exploration. As the other studies in the review tend to show, non-client types (either through personal experience or by word of mouth) may perceive current counseling methods and counselors as being inadequate for their type of concerns.

Carson and Heine (1962) studied the relationship of therapist-patient personality similarity on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory to therapeutic success. Therapists used in the study were medical students treating outpatients under supervision. Composite ratings by the supervising psychiatrists constituted the criteria of therapy success. The results of the study indicated that a curvilinear relationship exists between therapist-patient personality similarity and success of psychotherapy. They concluded that in cases of high similarity, the therapist might be unable to maintain suitable distance and objectivity, and in cases of dissimilarity, he would lack empathic understanding of the patient's problems. It therefore appears that extremes in both similarity and dissimilarity lead to low success in psychotherapy.

In an attempt to replicate the study by Carson and Heine, Lichtenstein (1966) followed their identical methodology almost to the letter in a different setting. The one difference in the replication attempt was the failure to administer the MMPI to patients and therapists at the same time. Utilizing the same success criterion as Carson and Heine, Lichtenstein found no relationship existing between the measures of similarity and therapy success. In order to examine for possible differences due to the time interval in taking the MMPI, therapist-patient dyads taking the test within a three-month period of each other were compared with dyads taking the test within three to seven months of each other. Once again no relationship was found. Possibly the equivocal nature of the research findings on personality similarity and therapeutic success may be attributed to inadequate measures of both therapeutic success and personality similarity.

Welkowitz et al. (1967) studied value system similarity in patient-therapist dyads. Their study was based on the proposition that there is movement toward similarity or equilibrium in social interaction in a two-person relationship. The sample, consisting of 38 therapists and 44 patients, was administered the Ways to Live Scale and the

Strong Vocational Interest Blank for the purpose of measuring value similarity. The findings of the study indicated that therapists were more similar in values to their own patients than to patients of other therapists. Patients rated as "most improved" by their therapists were closer to their therapists in values than patients rated "least improved." It was also found that therapists did not share a common value system and that the longer a therapist-patient dyad existed, the possibility of value similarity existing between therapist and patient increased.

Cartwright and Lerner (1963), in a study of therapy outcome, found that same-sex patients who improved in therapy were initially seen by the therapist as more like himself than the patients' own self ratings would suggest. They concluded that this reduction of distance seems to imply an immediate emotional acceptance of these people. In contrast, the same-sex patients who were subsequently rated as unimproved were held off emotionally at the beginning of therapy and seen by the therapist as more different from him than their own ratings placed them as being. For opposite-sex patients, the findings were reversed. It may be inferred from these findings that experienced therapists who have less personal threat decrease distance between themselves and their same-sex patient by communicating to patients the idea that: "You are really much more like me than you think you are." This message from a prestigeful person of the same sex probably reduces the patient's threat level which in turn leads to therapy gains. In cases of low therapy gains, this encouragement is apparently not communicated. Therapy gains for opposite-sex patients are evidently most faciliated when identification with the therapist doesn't occur.

van der Veen's (1965) study was similar to the Heller et al. (1963) study of differential client effects on the counselor. He used raters of patient and therapist behaviors, but did not employ coached clients. Therapists were rated on congruence and accurate empathy, while patients were rated on problem expression and immediacy of experiencing. This study was an intensive analysis of the therapeutic interaction between three patients and five therapists (each therapist had two interviews with each patient for a total of 30 sessions); the patient, the therapist, and to some extent the particular patient-therapist combination were identified by the raters as determinants of the patient's behavior. The therapists' behavior was judged to be a function of the therapist and the patient. Generalizability of these results is limited by lack of randomness in subject selection and failure to expose the subjects to systematically varied conditions. The primary finding seems to be the identification of the patient-therapist combination as being the important influence on interview dynamics and hence, generalized outcome.

Most of the research and writing relating to ideal client types, communication of counselor bias, and counselor-client match was, out of necessity, derived from clinical settings because very little research had been done with school counselors on these three topics. Furthermore, the research and theory shortage in these three areas having relevance for school counseling opens the question of just how seriously have school counselors and counselor educators considered the dynamics of counseling? How well, if at all, have these people considered the influences of client preference, bias communication, and counselor-client similarity on counseling outcomes? Thus far it appears that counselors and their mentors will have to rely largely on clinical studies for keys to unlock the "mysteries" involved in making counseling work. Possibly clinical studies will have their most value to counselors in suggesting testable hypotheses applicable to the school counseling setting.

The main theme in this research and literature review is that people in counseling professions do have preferred or ideal clients with whom they tend to be more successful. Preference for certain client types seems to influence selection of clients, duration of counseling, and counseling outcomes. The literature bears out the fact that counselor biases and feelings tend to be communicated to the client and that to mask unfavorable feelings about a client is destructive to the counseling relationship. The counselor is most effective when he is working in a state of congruency (being himself) and, as such, acts as an authenticity model for his client. The feigning of client interest and acceptance is a type of hypocrisy easily spotted by both children and adolescents. Finally, it appears that a large number of people needing professional counseling services are excluded from the ideal client types of three major groups offering these services. Therapists from these three groups have a large amount of freedom in selecting their clients and tend to choose those people who are most like themselves in education, background, and interest. The questions that remain are : "What do school counselors do about this problem?" Do they have ideal client types and do they counsel effectively with only a relatively small group of students with the result being that "good" counseling is unavailable for many non-preferred students?

# CHAPTER III

## PROCEDURES

Chapter III presents the procedures used in the study. Included are: a description of the population, methodology, a description of instruments, and techniques for analysis and presentation of data.

The design of the study is based on the assumption that counselors prefer to counsel and consider Ideal those students with whom they tend to be most successful; and conversely, least prefer to counsel those students with whom they are least successful. Rationale for this assumption was developed in Chaper I and supported in the Chapter II literature review.

### Population

Ten counselors were selected for the study with one male counselor and one female counselor coming from each of five high schools. Each counselor participating in the study held the master's degree and certification to work as an Ohio school counselor and each had at least three years of experience. These educational and experience requirements were used in order to ensure minimal training and competency levels. Counselors participating in the study were not restricted by the school administration to counseling a particular student type; however, one counselor mentioned that she spent most of her counseling time with college bound students.

The five high schools used in the study were from the Columbus City School System in Columbus, Ohio. One high school also housed a partial junior high school program which was in the process of being transferred to a new building. These particular five schools were selected for the study because their students were normatively distributed in three broad curriculum areas: college preparatory, vocational, and general. These schools had no fewer than 35% and no more than 60% of their students enrolled in any one of the three curriculum programs.

Two hundred clients were used in the study. They were selected by the counselors as clients they had interviewed at least four times during the school year. One hundred of the clients were those students with whom the counselors felt they had been most successful and the other 100 were students with whom the counselors felt they had been least successful. Six of the 200 clients were selected from the junior high school population located in one of the high schools. The remaining 194 students were normally distributed among grades 10, 11, and 12.

Methodology

Each of the ten counselors was asked to list the ten most successful clients and the ten least successful clients whom they had interviewed at least four times during the school year. The counselors also selected two alternate clients for each group in the event that student absence or student refusal to participate in the study would become a factor. For each of his 20 clients, the counselor was asked to indicate his perception of the following:

1. type of problem the client had (vocational, educational, and/or emotional) (Callis, 1965);

2. problem cause (lack of self information, lack of environmental information, self conflict, conflict with others, and/or lack of skill) (Callis, 1965); and

3. degree of counseling success (rated on a nine-point scale with nine being the highest rating).

Counselors were also asked to write out the criteria they used for counseling success or failure on each client. (See Appendix A for the Interview Guide for Counselors)

Each of the selected 200 clients was asked if he would participate in a research project designed to study and improve school counseling. Only two clients in the five schools indicated that they would prefer not to participate in the study. One was listed as a successful client and the other as an unsuccessful client.

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was administered to each counselor and each **client.** Following the completion of the MBTI, each client was interviewed on his

1. perception of the helpfulness of counseling on a scale from one to nine (nine being the highest rating);

2. perception of problem type: vocational, emotional, and/or educational (Callis, 1965);

3. perception of problem cause: lack of self information, lack of environmental information, self conflict, conflict with others, and/or lack of skill (Callis, 1965);

4. perception of why counseling was or was not helpful;

5. perception of the counselor's job and what, if any, improvements or suggestions would care to make;

6. curriculum type: college preparatory, vocational, or general;

7. future plans: college, business or technical school, military, employment, school termination, marriage, none, and business ownership; and

8. parents' occupations.

Levels of parents' occupations were assessed according to Roe's (1956) scheme for classifying occupations. She had six levels in her classification: (1) professional and managerial, higher; (2) professional and managerial, regular; (3) semi-professional and managerial, lower; (4) skilled; (5) semi-skilled; and (6) unskilled.

Before each interview, the clients were told that all individual client information would be confidential and that the counselors would be informed only of the total group report derived from the 200 clients in the five high schools. A copy of the Interview Guide for Clients is presented in Appendix B. In addition to the MBTI and interview data, each client's grade point average and tenth grade Henmon-Nelson Intelligence Test score were obtained from his permanent record.

## Instruments

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) was used to assess client-counselor personality similarity. This instrument, based on a modification of the Jungian theory of type, has four scales measuring the subject's orientation to problem solving or his general life style. These scales are Judgment-Perception, Thinking-Feeling, Sensation-Intuition, and Extroversion-Introversion. Subjects can be classified according to each dimension such as being an I or E type or according to a combination of all four dimensions (e.g.,ESTJ). Mendelsohn (1966) and Stricker and Ross (1962 and 1963) point out that the four scales correlate with several variables including interest, aptitude, achievement, needs, personality, and behavioral measures.

The purpose of the MBTI is to determine from self-reports of behavior, preferences, and value judgments, people's basic personality types in regard to the way in which these types perceive their environment and thereby make decisions from what has been perceived (Myers, 1962). The MBTI (Form E) is especially well-suited for use with secondary school students because it can easily be administered within the normal length classroom period of 42 minutes. Another advantage is that the indicator utilizes no diagnostic clinical categories in its profile analysis. None of the 16 personality types carries any negative connotations and none of the items in the indicator is of a threatening personal nature. The examinee may participate in the evaluation of the data gleaned from the indicator, because the classification depends upon his preferences and choices made from equally creditable alternatives.

In regard to the four scales, Myers (1962) writes that in terms of the theory, a person will probably develop most skill with the processes he prefers to use and in the areas where he prefers to use them. If he scores higher on Extroversion (E) than on Introversion (I), he should be more adult and effective in dealing with his environment than with ideas. If he scores higher on the Sensing (S) scale than on Intuition (N), he should be more effective in perceiving facts than possiblities. Higher scores on the Thinking scale (T) than on the Feeling scale (F) mean that the person should be more adult in his thinking judgments than in his feeling judgments. If he scores higher on Judgment (J) than on Perception (P), he should be more skillful in ordering his environment than in adapting to it.

The Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability for grades 9-12 is designed to measure those aspects of mental ability which are important for success in academic work and in similar endeavors outside the classroom (Lamke and Nelson, 1957). The test consists of two forms (A and B) and each form contains 90 items. The items are arranged in order of increasing difficulty. As in the case of the MBTI, the Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability is well suited for classroom use in that it has a time limit of 30 minutes. Scoring is simplified through the test's carbon-ink self-marking system. The Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability is administered to each student in the Columbus system twice during his educational career. The test for grades 6-9, form A or B, is administered in the seventh grade. In the tenth grade, students take the Henmon-Nelson Test for grades 9-12, form A and B. The Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability are predicated on the student's ability to work with arithmetic, number sequences, analogies, and synonyms; and as such, they are good predictors of the student's ability to master academic tasks.

The Interview Guide for Counselors (see Appendix A) was developed by the investigator for purposes of obtaining information about each counselor's 12 most successful (Ideal) clients and 12 least successful (Non-preferred) clients. The instrument consists of two pages--one page for each client group. Each counselor was requested to list each client's name, grade, problem classification, problem cause, and counseling success rating. In addition, the counselors listed the criteria for counseling success or failure. The main purpose of the instrument was to give structure to the counselors' consideration of their most successful and least successful clients. The interview guide required the counselors to consider how successful or unsuccessful they were with each client as well as why they felt successful or unsuccessful with a particular client. Further, the instrument required the counselors to consider the client's problem, possible causes for the problem, and their relationship to counseling outcomes.

The Interview Guide for Clients (see Appendix B) was developed by the investigator for purposes of structuring personal interviews with each of the 200 clients participating in the study. Information was derived about the client's perception of the helpfulness of counseling, his preception of the problem brought to counseling, and his thoughts about the problem cause. In addition, information was sought on why or why not the client found counseling helpful, the client's perception of the counselor's job, and the suggestions or improvements clients might have to offer counselors. Other data requested from the client included the type of curriculum he was taking, tentative plans made for the future, and parents' occupations.

Data obtained from the two interview guides on perceptions of the problem, problem cause, and counseling success rating were used in comparing counselor-client agreement between the two client groups. The criteria listed by counselors for counseling outcome success or failure were studied for inter-counselor agreement or consistency. The two client groups were compared on data gathered from the clients on reasons for counseling helpfulness or lack of helpfulness, on perceptions of the counselor's job, and on suggestions for counselor improvement. Data on curriculum type, future plans, and parents' occupational levels were also compared for the two client groups.

## Data Analysis

Following collection of the data as described above, the data were analyzed according to the purpose of the study. Three types of data were collected and then analyzed through the statistical procedures described below: (1) test data, (2) interview data, and (3) cumulative record data.

Data gathered from the counselors' and clients' MBTI continuous score profiles were punched on IBM cards. One IBM card was punched for each of the 200 clients with the following information:

(a) the client's identification number (1-20);
(b) the client's counselor's number (1-10);
(c) the client's group (successful (1) or unsuccessful (2));
(d) the client's counselor's MBTI scores for the four scales: El, SN, TF, and JP;
(e) the client's MBTI scores for the four scales: El, SN, TF, and JP;
(f) the client's IQ score; and
(g) the client's grade point average.

A two-way analysis of variance with 10 observations per cell was used to determine if any differences existed between the two client groups on counselor-client similarity as measured by the four Myers-Briggs Type Indicator Scales of Extroversion-Introversion, Thinking-Feeling, Sensing-Intuition, and Judgment-Perception. The same statistical test was also employed to ascertain if the two client groups differed on grade point average and on the Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability. The above data were processed on a 7094 computer utilizing an MR 90 program.

Combining the suggestions of Mood (1950) and Lindquist (1953) on when it is appropriate to use the interaction term rather than the error term (deviations) as the divisor in calculating F ratios, the following procedure was devised. First, the F ratio for determining the significance of the interaction was calculated by dividing the error term (MSe) into $MS_3$, the mean square interaction value. If the resulting F ratio proved to be significant, indicating significant interaction, the error term was retained as the divisor for calculating the F ratios for counseling outcome and counselor effects. If, however, the interaction F ratio proved not to be significant, indicating no significant interaction between counselor and counseling outcome, the interaction term was retained as the divisor for calculating the F ratios for the counseling outcome and counselor effects. The following table adapted from Mood (1950) represents the two-factor analysis of variance technique as it was employed in the study (see Table I).

Counseling success rating data were analyzed for counselor-client agreement utilizing the Mann-Whitney U Test (Siegel, 1956). Differences between the counselors' and clients' ratings were computed for both client groups. These differences were then ranked and submitted to the U test. The value of U may be obtained by counting the number of group #1 (successful clients) scores equal to or exceeding group #2 (unsuccessful clients) scores. For each group #1 score that exceeds a group #2 score, the value of U is increased by 1.0. In cases of large sample sizes U may be computed by assigning ranks to the numbers in a combined ranking of the two groups and solving for U as follows:

$$U = N_1N_2 + \frac{N_1\ (N_1 + 1)}{2} - R_1 \quad ,$$

$N_1$ = size of group #1 ,

$N_2$ = size of group #2 , and

$R_1$ = sum of the ranks assigned to the group whose sample size is $N_1$.

Possible differences in the outcome ratings of the two groups were analyzed by a T test for comparing group means. The formula used for computing a T or critical ratio for two means was the following one extracted from Edwards (1959):

$$T = \frac{S_x - S_y}{SE_{S_x - S_y}} \quad ,$$

where

$S_x$ = the mean of group x ,

$S_y$ = the mean of group y , and

$SE_{S_x - S_y}$ = the standard error of difference between the two means.

## TABLE I

### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR TWO-FACTOR EXPERIMENTS WITH TEN OBSERVATIONS PER CELL

| Source of Variation | Degrees of Freedom | Sum of Squares | Mean Square | F (ratio) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counseling Outcome | 2-1 = 1 | $10 \cdot 10 \sum_{i=1}^{2} [\bar{X}_{i\cdot\cdot} - \bar{X}]^2 = S_1$ | $\frac{S_1}{1} = MS_1$ | $\frac{MS_1}{MSe}$ |
| Counselors | 10-1 = 9 | $10 \cdot 2 \sum_{j} [\bar{X}_{\cdot j \cdot} - \bar{X}]^2 = S_2$ | $\frac{S_2}{2} = MS_2$ | $\frac{MS_2}{MS_3}$ |
| Interaction | 1 x 9 = 9 | $10 \sum_{i} \sum_{j} [\bar{X}_{ij\cdot} - \bar{X}_{i\cdot\cdot} - \bar{X}_{\cdot j\cdot} + X]^2 = S_3$ | $\frac{S_3}{9} = MS_3$ | $\frac{MS_3}{MSe}$ |
| Error | 2·10(9) = 180 | $\sum_{i} \sum_{j} \sum_{k} [X_{ijk} - \bar{X}_{ij\cdot}]^2 = S_4$ | $\frac{S_4}{180} = MSe$ | |
| Total | 200-1 = 199 | $\sum_{i} \sum_{j} \sum_{k} [X_{ijk} - \bar{X}]^2$ | | |

Observations are denoted by $X_{ijk}$; i denotes counseling outcomes; j denotes counselors; k denotes observations per cell.

The client data obtained on sex, curriculum type, future plans, and parents' occupational levels were analyzed for differences between the two client groups by computing $X^2$ values from contingency tables as outlined by Siegel (1956).

$$T = \frac{S_x - S_y}{SE_{S_x - S_y}} ,$$

where

$S_x$ = the mean of group x ,

$S_y$ = the mean of group y , and

$SE_{S_x - S_y}$ = the standard error of difference between the two means.

The client data obtained on sex, curriculum type, future plans, and parents' occupational levels were analyzed for differences between the two client groups by computing $X^2$ values from contingency tables as outlined by Siegel (1956).

$X^2$ is computed as follows:

$$X^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{k} \frac{(Oij - Eij)^2}{Eij} ,$$

where

Oij = observed number of cases categorized in the ith row of jth column,

Eij = number of cases expected under the null hypothesis to be categorized in the ith row of the jth column, and

$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \sum_{j=1}^{k}$ = directs one to sum over all cells.

Data on counselor-client agreement on problem category and problem cause were also analyzed through computation of $X^2$ values to determine whether the amount of counselor-client agreement differed between the two client groups. In this instance a 2 x 3 contingency table was utilized to investigate counselor-client agreement on the problem category and the problem cause. Three levels of counselor-client agreement were tabulated for analysis: (1) similarity (complete agreement); (2) middle similarity (partial agreement), and (3) disimilarity (complete disagreement).

Data on counselor-client sex matching were analyzed from 2 x 2 contingency tables for both male and female counselors. A 2 x 3 table was used to analyze possible client group differences in curriculum type. A 2 x 8 table was used for data on clients' future plans and a 2 x 6 table for clients' parents' occupational levels. Data on the number of clients who had mothers working outside the home were analyzed on a 2 x 2 contingency table for possible group differences.

Client interview comments on the helpfulness of counseling, suggestions for counselor improvement, and perceptions of the counselor's role were summarized in tabular form. Counselors' criteria for counseling success and non-success were also summarized in tabular form.

## Summary

Chapter III presented a description of the procedures used in the study. Included were descriptions of the population, methodology, instruments, and data analysis.

Ten full-time, certified high school counselors (five male and five female) were asked to list the 12 clients with whom they felt they had been most successful and the 12 clients with whom they felt they had been least successful during the school year. For each of these clients the counselor (1) noted the perceived degree of counseling success on a nine point scale, (2) listed the problem category, (3) listed the problem cause, and (4) wrote out the criteria he used to determine counseling success or failure. A male and female counselor from each of five selected high schools participated in the study.

Ten clients from each of the counselors' two lists were selected for the study, making a total of 200 clients--100 successful clients and 100 unsuccessful clients. The two client groups were compared on the following items:

(1) Counselor-client personality similarity;

(2) Counselor-client agreement on the values of the counseling experience;

(3) Counselor-client agreement on the nature of the problem category;

(4) Counselor-client agreement on the nature of the problem cause;

(5) Grade point averages;

(6) Intelligence test scores;

(7) Curriculum type;

(8) Parents' occupational classifications;

(9) Number of mothers working outside the home;

(10) Future plans;

(11) Sex matching between counselor and client;

(12) Client interview comments on:

    (a) the value of counseling,
    (b) suggestions for counselor improvement, and
    (c) perceptions of counselor role; and

(13) Their counselors' criteria for counseling success or failure.

Chapter IV will present the findings of the study.

# CHAPTER IV

## FINDINGS

The findings of the study are presented in this chapter. The data will be presented in the same order as the hypotheses were stated in Chapter I. Each of the four hypotheses were tested statistically under the general null hypothesis that differences between counselors' ideal and non-preferred client types would be equal to zero.

Hypothesis I. School counselors have stereotyped client types with whom they prefer and prefer not to counsel. There is no significant difference between these two client groups in the following areas:

(a) Grade point average
(b) Intelligence test score
(c) Curriculum type
(d) Future plans
(e) Sex
(f) Parents occupational level
(g) Problem type
(h) Problem cause
(i) Counselor and client agreement on problem type
(j) Counselor and client agreement on the problem cause

### (a) Grade point average

Grade point averages were calculated from the permanent records for each of the two client groups. For the 194 high school students in the sample, grade point averages were figured from course grades made in grades nine through their grade level at the time of the study. For the six junior high school students, grade point averages were based on coursework completed in grades seven through their present grade level. Ideal (successful) clients were found to have a mean point average of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale, while non-preferred (unsuccessful) clients averaged 1.2. Mean point averages for each counselor's two groups of clients are presented in Table 2. A two-way analysis of variance was run on the grade point average data to test whether or not the two client groups differed significantly on this dimension. The F ratio of 36.610 obtained from the data analysis was found to be significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. Therefore, the hypothesis stating that no significant difference exists between ideal and non-preferred client types on grade point average was rejected. The two-way analysis of variance data is presented in Table 3.

While there is an apparent overall effect existing between client

## TABLE 2

## MEAN GRADE POINT AVERAGES FOR EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELOR'S TWO CLIENT GROUPS

| Counselor Number | Ideal Clients (successful) | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2.6 | 1.9 |
| 2 | 2.0 | 1.1 |
| 3 | 1.8 | 0.9 |
| 4 | 2.9 | 1.4 |
| 5 | 2.5 | 1.0 |
| 6 | 1.7 | 1.1 |
| 7 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| 8 | 2.1 | 1.3 |
| 9 | 2.1 | 1.3 |
| 10 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| Total group means | 2.06 | 1.25 |

Difference between the two means is significant beyond the .001 level of confidence.

## TABLE 3

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GRADE POINT AVERAGE AND CLIENT IDEALNESS

| Source | d.f. | SS | MS | F | Significance Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Client Idealness (success) | 1 | 30.6545 | 30.6545 | 36.610 | .001 |
| Counselor | 9 | 19.2413 | 2.13792 | 2.550 | .10 |
| Interaction | 9 | 7.5340 | .83711 | 1.670 | NS |
| Error | 180 | 90.2490 | .50138 | | |
| Total | 199 | 147.6788 | | | |

idealness and grade point average, it must be pointed out that some differences existed among the counselors on this dimension. The F ratio of 2.550 found for variation attributed to counselor differences is significant at the .10 level of confidence, hence indicating some difference among the 10 counselors for the relationship of client idealness to grade point average. The additive effects (interaction) of client idealness (success) and counselor influence were not found to be a significant source of variance (F ratio = 1.670).

(b) Intelligence test scores

Intelligence test scores were obtained from the students' permanent records. All of the 194 high school students had test scores in their cumulative folders for the Henmon Nelson Test of Mental Ability (for grades 9-12, form A or B) which was administered in their sophomore year of school. The six junior high school students were administered the same test for grades 6-9 in the seventh grade. The ideal (successful) client group had a mean intelligence test score of 104 and the nonpreferred (unsuccessful) client group had a mean intelligence test score of 100. Mean intelligence test scores for each counselor's two client groups are presented in Table 4. A two-way analysis of variance was run on the intelligence test score data to determine whether or not the two client groups differed significantly on this dimension. The calculated F ratio of 3.346 was found to be significant at the .07 level of confidence, but the hypothesis stating that the difference between the two client groups on intelligence test scores was equal to zero would have to be accepted at the .05 level of confidence. That such a seemingly small difference of four intelligence quotient points could be significant at the .07 level may be explained by the fact the the Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability utilize a transformation scale for changing raw scores into intelligence quotients and that four intelligence quotient points may often represent a raw score difference larger than the standard error of measurement that ranges from 3.50 to 4.15 raw score points for these tests. The two-way analysis of variance data for the Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability is presented in Table 5.

Variation attributable to counselor effect on the relationship between intelligence test scores and client idealness was significant beyond the .01 level of confidence (F = 4.316). Thus, it would be concluded that counselors differed among themselves on the intelligence test score factor in selecting their ideal client types. For some counselors rather large differences existed between the two client groups on the Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability, while for other counselors the group differences were small.

An F ratio of 1.880 was found in analyzing the variance caused by the interaction of counselor and counseling outcome. The F ratio of 1.880 is significant beyond the .05 level of confidence and is apparently indicative of the fact that additive effects of the counselor and counseling outcome do contribute to the variance.

## TABLE 4

### MEAN INTELLIGENCE TEST SCORES FOR EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELOR'S TWO CLIENT GROUPS

| Counselor Number | Ideal Clients (successful) | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | 107 | 116 |
| 2 | 106 | 101 |
| 3 | 106 | 94 |
| 4 | 118 | 105 |
| 5 | 104 | 93 |
| 6 | 95 | 91 |
| 7 | 102 | 109 |
| 8 | 103 | 106 |
| 9 | 103 | 93 |
| 10 | 97 | 100 |
| Total group means | 104 | 100 |

Difference between the two means is significant at the .07 level of confidence.

## TABLE 5

### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTELLIGENCE TEST SCORES AND CLIENT IDEALNESS

| Source | d.f. | SS | MS | F | Significance Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Client Idealness (success) | 1 | 561.125 | 561.125 | 3.346 | .07 |
| Counselor | 9 | 6514.245 | 723.805 | 4.316 | .01 |
| Interaction | 9 | 2830.325 | 314.480 | 1.880 | .05 |
| Error | 180 | 30187.900 | 167.710 | | |
| Total | 199 | 40093.595 | | | |

### (c) Curriculum type

Data on the school curriculum which each client was taking were gathered by the investigator during individual client interviews. School programs were classifiable into three general curriculum types: college preparatory, vocational, and general. Ideal clients were enrolled mostly in college preparatory programs, with 47 in this category as opposed to 18 from the non-preferred client group. Both client groups were equally represented in vocational education, with 21 ideal and 20 non-preferred clients taking vocational programs. In the general curriculum program, there were 62 non-preferred and 32 ideal clients (see Table 6).

A $X^2$ test was used to determine whether or not there were differences between the two client groups in their choices of curricula. The expected frequency of 32.5 for college preparatory program enrollment was found to differ significantly (.01 level of confidence) from the observed frequencies of 47 and 18 for the two client groups. Therefore, it may be concluded that more ideal clients than non-preferred clients are in college preparatory programs. The reverse proved to be true for clients enrolled in general programs. The expected frequency for this curriculum type, 47, was found to be significantly different at the .01 level from the observed frequencies of 32 for ideal clients and 62 for non-preferred clients. No significant differences were found between the two client groups on enrollment in vocational programs (21 ideal clients and 20 non-preferred clients). The data analysis is presented in a 2 x 2 contingency table (see Table 7).

### (d) Future plans

Data on the clients' future plans were also obtained in the interview. The following eight categories of future plans were devised prior to the interviews:

(1) Enter college,

(2) Enter technical or business training,

(3) Enter military service,

(4) Obtain employment,

(5) Leave school before graduation,

(6) Get married,

(7) No tentative plans for the future, and

(8) Organize own business.

## TABLE 6

## TYPES OF CURRICULA IN WHICH EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELOR'S TWO CLIENT GROUPS ARE ENROLLED

| Counselor Number | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | C | V | G | C | V | G |
| 1 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 7 |
| 4 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 6 |
| 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| 6 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| 7 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
| 9 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| 10 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| Total number of clients in each curriculum | 47 | 21 | 32 | 18 | 20 | 62 |

C = College Preparatory
V = Vocational
G = General

## TABLE 7

## 2 X 3 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES FOR THE CURRICULUM TYPES OF IDEAL AND NON- CLIENTS

| | College Preparatory | | Vocational | | General | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Significance Level | .001 | | NS | | .001 | | |
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 32.5 | 47 | 20.5 | 21 | 47 | 32 | 100 |
| Non-preferred Client (unsuccessful) | 32.5 | 18 | 20.5 | 20 | 47 | 62 | 100 |
| Totals | | 65 | | 41 | | 94 | 200 |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency; the other number is the observed frequency.

College entrance was selected as future plan choices by 49 ideal clients and 24 non-preferred clients. Technical or business training was selected by 24 non-preferred clients, while 15 ideal clients and 18 non-preferred clients selected the military service as their future plans. Obtaining employment after high school was selected by 15 ideal clients and 17 non-preferred clients with none of the 200 clients indicating that he planned to leave school before graduation. Only one client (non-preferred client, female) indicated that marriage was her immediate plan following high school graduation. Nine non-preferred clients indicated that they had no tentative future plans as opposed to four ideal clients in this category. Organizing one's own business or going into business for oneself was the future plan selected by seven non-preferred clients as opposed to only one ideal client (see Table 8).

Differences between the two client groups on choices of future plans were analyzed for significance by breaking the data down into a 2 x 5 contingency table. Then, the $X^2$ test was utilized to determine whether differences between observed and expected frequencies were greater than zero. Category five, leave school before graduating, was omitted from the analysis because none of the clients selected it. Categories 6, 7, and 8 were combined in order to meet the requirements of having at least five observations per cell in the contingency table. A $X^2$ value of 17.12 was found, which is significant beyond the .01 level of confidence, indicating that significant differences existed between the two client groups on two categories: I and the combined cateogries of 6, 7, and 8. No significant differences existed between the two groups on categories 2, 3, and 4. The 2 x 5 contingency table is presented in Table 9.

(e) Sex matching

Data were collected on counselor-client sex matching to determine whether or not counselors prefer to work with one sex more than the other, and therefore experience more success with their preferred type. The five male counselors selected 33 males and 17 females as ideal clients (successful) and 44 males and 6 females as non-preferred clients (unsuccessful). The five female counselors selected 25 males and 25 females as ideal clients (successful) and 32 males and 18 females as non-preferred clients (unsuccessful). Data for each counselor's client-sex preference is presented in Table 10.

Two 2 x 2 contingency tables were employed to determine whether sex differences existed between the ideal and non-preferred client types of the male and female counselors in the study. The frequencies within the two tables were submitted to a $X^2$ test. A $X^2$ value of 6.8 (significant beyond the .01 level of confidence) was calculated for the male counselors' clients. This $X^2$ value indicated that female clients experienced more than expected success with male counselors and that male clients experienced more than expected failure with their male counselors (see Table 11). Therefore, the male counselors

TABLE 8

FUTURE PLANS OF THE CLIENTS IN EACH OF THE
TEN COUNSELOR'S TWO CLIENT GROUPS

| | Future Plans | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | | | | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | | | | | | |
| Counselor Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 2 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 4 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 9 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 10 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Totals | 49 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 24 | 24 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 7 |

Code:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Enter College | 5 | Leave School before Graduation |
| 2 | Enter Technical or Business Training | 6 | Get Married |
| 3 | Enter Military | 7 | No Tentative Plans |
| 4 | Find Employment | 8 | Organize Own Business |

TABLE 9

## 2 X 5 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES FOR THE TYPES OF FUTURE PLANS SELECTED BY IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| NS | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 6,7,8 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Significance Levels | .01 | | NS | | NS | | NS | | .01 | | |
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 36.5 | 49 | 20 | 16 | 16.5 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 16 | 5 | 100 |
| Non-preferred Clients (successful) | 36.5 | 24 | 20 | 24 | 16.5 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 11 | 17 | 100<br>100 |
| Totals | | 73 | | 40 | | 33 | | 32 | | 22 | 200 |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

Code:
1 Enter College
2 Enter Technical or Business Training
3 Enter Military
4 Find Employment
5 Leave School before Graduation (this category was not chosen by any of the 200 clients)
6 Get Married
7 No Tentative Plans
8 Organize Own Business (categories 6, 7, and 8 were combined in order to meet the minimum requirement of five observations per cell.)

## TABLE 10

## COUNSELOR-CLIENT SEX MATCHING EFFECTS FOR EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELOR'S TWO CLIENT TYPES

| Counselor Number and sex | Ideal Clients (successful) | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Male | Female | Male | Female |
| 1 (F) | 6 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 (M) | 7 | 3 | 9 | 1 |
| 3 (M) | 5 | 5 | 9 | 1 |
| 4 (F) | 7 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| 5 (F) | 4 | 6 | 7 | 3 |
| 6 (M) | 8 | 2 | 10 | 0 |
| 7 (M) | 9 | 1 | 10 | 0 |
| 8 (F) | 3 | 7 | 6 | 4 |
| 9 (M) | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| 10 (F) | 5 | 5 | 10 | 0 |
| Totals | 58 | 42 | 76 | 24 |

## TABLE 11

## 2 X 2 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES FOR MALE COUNSELORS' CLIENT-SEX PREFERENCE IN THE IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENT GROUPS

| | Male Clients | | Female Clients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Significance Level | .01 | | .01 | | |
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 38.5 | 33 | 11.5 | 17 | 50 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 38.5 | 44 | 11.5 | 6 | 50 |
| Totals | | 77 | | 23 | |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

had more than the expected number of female ideal clients and fewer than the expected number of male ideal clients in their two selected client groups.

A $X^2$ value of 2.0 (not significant) was calculated for the female counselors' clients. Lack of significant differences between expected and observed success and failure frequencies between male and female clients would indicate that sex-matching was not as important to the female counselors in selecting their ideal and non-preferred client types (see Table 12).

Although female clients didn't differ significantly from their male counterparts in experiencing more counseling outcome success with their female counselors, there was trend in this direction. Therefore, a $X^2$ test was run on the combined client groups of the male and female counselors to ascertain whether the female clients were experiencing more counseling success than the male clients, and thereby comprising a larger than normal proportion of the ideal client types in the sample. The combined data on client sex type is presented in Table 13. This table shows that 58 males and 42 females were selected as ideal clients (successful) and that 76 males and 24 females were selected as non-preferred clients (unsuccessful). To accept the null hypothesis ($H_0$), that no difference exists between the two groups in the proportion of males and females selected as ideal and non-preferred client types, the $X^2$ value would have to be less than 6.64 with one degree of freedom at the .01 level of confidence. Inasmuch as the $X^2$ value was found to be 7.4, the $H_0$ is rejected in favor of $H_1$: the female clients experienced more than expected counseling success and thus comprise a greater proportion of the ideal client group than do the male clients, who experienced somewhat more than expected counseling failure.

### (f) Parents' occupational classifications

Utilizing Roe's (1956) six-level scheme for classifying occupations, jobs held by the clients' parents were classified according to one of the following categories:

(1) Professional and managerial (higher)
(e.g. Corporation President, Social Scientist, Physicist)

(2) Professional and managerial (regular)
(e.g. Physician, Teacher, Sales Manager)

(3) Semi-professional and managerial (lower)
(e.g. Librarian, Laboratory Technician, Draftsman)

(4) Skilled
(e.g. Mason, Barber, Private Secretary)

(5) Semi-skilled
(e.g. Janitor, Truck Driver, Waiter)

## TABLE 12

## 2 X 2 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES FOR FEMALE COUNSELORS' CLIENT-SEX PREFERENCE IN THE IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENT GROUPS

| Significance Level | Male Clients<br>NS | | Female Clients<br>NS | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 28.5 | 25 | 21.5 | 25 | 50 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 28.5 | 32 | 21.5 | 18 | 50 |
| Totals | | 57 | | 43 | |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

## TABLE 13

## 2 X 3 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED SEX DIFFERENCE FREQUENCIES IN THE IDEAL AND NON-PREFFERED CLIENT GROUPS

| Significance Level | Male Clients<br>.01 | | Female Clients<br>.01 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 67 | 58 | 33 | 42 | 100 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 67 | 76 | 33 | 24 | 100 |
| Totals | | 134 | | 66 | |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

(6) Unskilled
(e.g. Helper, Watchman, Farmhand)

In addition, data were also collected on the number of clients' mothers working outside the home. These two types of data were then analyzed for possible differences existing between the two client groups. The professional and managerial, higher category, had only one parent from the ideal client group and two parents from the non-preferred client group. The professional and managerial, regular category, also failed to differentiate between the parents of the two client groups. It had 28 parents of the ideal client group and 26 parents of the non-preferred group. The third level, semi-professional and managerial, lower, did discriminate between the two client groups with 30 parents of ideal clients and 16 parents of non-preferred clients falling in this category. The skilled workers category contained similar numbers of parents of both client groups--28 parents of ideal clients and 20 parents of non-preferred clients. The semi-skilled worker category with 5 parents of ideal clients and 15 parents of non-preferred clients did distinguish between the two groups. The final category, unskilled worker, contained only one representative, a parent of a non-preferred client (see Table 14).

Group differences in parents' occupational levels were analyzed for significance by comparing the frequencies in a 2 x 4 contingency table on a $X^2$ test. Categories one and two were combined as were categories five and six so that each cell in the table would contain a minimum of five observations (see Table 15). A $X^2$ value of 11.1 was obtained and found to be significant beyond the .02 level of confidence. Thus, the hypothesis, stating that differences between the two client groups on parents' occupational level would equal zero, was rejected. The categories of one, two, four, and six did not show any group differences, but the differences in categories three and five were large enough to reject the hypothesis. Therefore, we may conclude that while variation did occur on parents' occupational levels, they were not extreme. In fact, the highest and lowest levels had to be dropped because they represented only the parents of four clients.

Consideration of the number of mothers working outside the home reinforces the relative homogeneity of the occupational level data. The ideal client group had 53 mothers working outside the home and 45 working as full-time housewives within the home. The non-preferred client group had 51 mothers working outside the home and 46 mothers working as full-time housewives. No significant differences were, of course, noted in the frequencies presented in Table 16.

(g) Problem type

Data gathered on the types of problems considered in the counseling sessions for the two client groups were classified according to the diagnostic classification outlined by Callis (1965). His three

## TABLE 14

## OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS FOR THE PARENTS OF EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELOR'S IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS AND THE NUMBER OF CLIENTS' MOTHERS WORKING OUTSIDE OF THE HOME

| | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | | | | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | WM | HW | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | WM | HW |
| 1 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 |
| 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 |
| 4 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 3 |
| 5 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 |
| 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 8 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 3 |
| 9 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| 10 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 3 |
| Totals | 1 | 28 | 30 | 28 | 5 | 0 | 53 | 45 | 2 | 26 | 16 | 30 | 15 | 1 | 51 | 46 |

Code:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | Professional and Managerial-higher |
| 2 | Professional and Managerial-regular |
| 3 | Semi-professional and Managerial-lower |
| 4 | Skilled |
| 5 | Semi-skilled |
| 6 | Unskilled |

WM-Mothers working outside the home
HW-Mothers working as housewives

## TABLE 15

## 2 X 4 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES OF PARENTS' OCCUPATIONAL LEVELS FOR IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| | 1 and 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 and 6 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Significance Level | NS | | .02 | | NS | | .02 | | |
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 29 | 29 | 23 | 30 | 29 | 28 | 11 | 5 | 92 |
| Non-preferred Clients (successful) | 28 | 28 | 23 | 16 | 29 | 30 | 11 | 16 | 90 |
| Totals | | 57 | | 46 | | 58 | | 21 | 182 |

Categories 1 & 2 and 5 & 6 were combined to meet the minimum requirement of five observations per cell.

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

Code:

1 – Professional and Managerial-higher
2 – Professional and Managerial-regular
3 – Semi-professional and Managerial-lower
4 – Skilled
5 – Semi-Skilled
6 – Unskilled

## TABLE 16

## 2 X 2 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES FOR IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS' MOTHERS EMPLOYED OUTSIDE THE HOME AND AS HOUSEWIVES ONLY

| | Mothers Working Outside the Home | | Mothers Working As Housewives Only | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Significance Level | NS | | NS | | |
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 52 | 53 | 46 | 45 | 98 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 52 | 51 | 45 | 46 | 97 |
| Totals | | 104 | | 91 | 195 |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

general problem descriptions of vocational, emotional, and educational were used in 2 x 3 contingency tables to determine whether any differences existed between the two client groups on problem types. Three types of analyses were employed to measure possible group differences. First, both client groups were checked against each other on their perceptions of the problems brought to counseling. Then, secondly, counselors' perceptions of the problems discussed with the two client groups were compared between the two groups. A third technique compared the two client groups on counselor-client agreement on the nature of the problem. Data on the clients' perceptions of the problem are presented in Table 17 and the counselors' perceptions of the problems are presented in Table 19. Table 21 presents the agreement between counselor and client on the nature of the problem. Three categories of agreement were utilized: similarity, middle similarity, and dissimilarity. If the counselor and client agreed completely on the nature of the counseling problem or problems, the similarity category was checked. If they only partially agreed, the middle similarity category was checked. Total disagreement between counselor and client were tabulated in the dissimilarity category.

The data on the nature of counseling problems were analyzed for group differences by submitting the expected and observed frequencies presented in 2 x 3 contingency tables to $X^2$ tests. Comparing ideal and non-preferred clients on their perceptions of their problems brought to counseling, it was found that ideal clients checked a total of 169 problems with 54 being vocational, 35 emotional, and 80 educational. Non-preferred clients checked 173 problems with 33 being vocational, 53 emotional, and 87 educational (see Table 17).

A $X^2$ analysis of the problem type data revealed that the two client groups differed significantly on the number of vocational and emotional problems brought to counseling. Ideal clients checked 21 more vocational problems and 18 fewer emotional problems than did the non-preferred client group. The $X^2$ value of 9.3 was significant at the .01 level of confidence. No significant difference between the two groups was observed for the educational problem category (see Table 18).

Comparing group differences on counselors' perceptions of problems brought to counseling, it was found that for ideal clients, counselors checked 128 problems with 30 being vocational, 27 emotional, and 71 educational. For non-preferred clients, counselors checked 146 problems --16 vocational, 65 emotional, and 65 educational (see Table 19).

A $X^2$ analysis of the counselors' perceptions of clients' problems indicated that rather significant differences were found between the groups on the vocational and emotional categories. As in the case with the clients' perceptions of problems, counselors indicated for the ideal client group more vocational (30 to 16) and fewer emotional concerns (27 to 65) than did the non-preferred client group. A $X^2$ value of 16.8 was significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. Once again, no significant difference between the two groups was observed for the educational problems category (see Table 20).

## TABLE 17

## PROBLEM CATEGORIES SELECTED BY THE CLIENTS IN EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELORS' TWO CLIENT GROUPS

Problem Categories

| Counselor Number | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Vocational | Emotional | Educational | Vocational | Emotional | Educational |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| 2 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 1 | 3 | 8 |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 10 |
| 4 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 2 | 10 |
| 5 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| 6 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 7 | 7 |
| 7 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| 8 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 7 |
| 9 | 7 | 4 | 9 | 5 | 8 | 10 |
| 10 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 9 |
| Totals | 54 | 35 | 80 | 33 | 53 | 87 |

## TABLE 18

## 2 X 3 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES FOR THE PROBLEM CATEGORIES SELECTED BY IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| | Vocational | | Emotional | | Educational | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Significance Level | .01 | | .01 | | NS | | |
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 43 | 54 | 44 | 35 | 82 | 80 | 169 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 44 | 33 | 44 | 53 | 85 | 87 | 173 |
| Totals | | 87 | | 88 | | 167 | 342 |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

## TABLE 19

## PROBLEM CATEGORIES SELECTED BY EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELORS FOR THEIR TWO CLIENT GROUPS

Problem Categories

| | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number | Vocational | Emotional | Educational | Vocational | Emotional | Educational |
| 1 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 7 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 10 | 7 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 6 | 8 |
| 5 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 7 |
| 6 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 9 |
| 7 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| 9 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| 10 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 5 |
| Totals | 30 | 27 | 71 | 16 | 65 | 65 |

## TABLE 20

## 2 X 3 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES FOR THE PROBLEM CATEGORIES SELECTED BY COUNSELORS FOR THEIR IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| | Vocational | | Emotional | | Educational | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Significance Level | .001 | | .001 | | NS | | |
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 22 | 30 | 43 | 27 | 72 | 71 | 128 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 24 | 16 | 49 | 65 | 64 | 65 | 146 |
| Totals | | 46 | | 92 | | 136 | 274 |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

For purposes of checking differences in the amount of agreement on problem categories for the two client groups, the amounts of complete agreement, partial agreement, and total disagreement were tabulated for all 200 counselor-client dyads. Complete agreement (similarity) occurred 28 times for ideal clients and 26 times for non-preferred clients. Partial agreement occurred 60 times for ideal clients and 26 times for non-preferred clients. Total disagreement occurred only 28 times--12 for the non-preferred client group (see Table 21).

A $X^2$ value of 2.0 indicated that the hypothesis (differences in counselor-client problem category agreement between the two groups are equal to zero) should be accepted. To be considered significant, the $X^2$ value would have to equal or exceed 5.9 at the .05 level of confidence with 2 degrees of freedom. Table 22 presents a breakdown of observed and expected frequencies for counselor-client problem category agreement.

### (h) Problem cause

Causes of the problem brought to counseling were tabulated and analyzed in the same manner employed for problem type. Once again Callis's (1965) diagnostic scheme was employed. It consists of five general problem causes, i.e.,

(1) lack of self information,

(2) lack of environmental information,

(3) self conflict,

(4) conflict with others, and

(5) lack of skill.

Problem cause data were submitted to three types of analyses for purposes of ascertaining whether or not the two client groups differed on (1) clients' perceptions of problem causes, (2) counselors' perceptions of problem causes, and (3) counselor-client agreement on problem causes.

Results of the study indicated that the ideal client group selected a total of 181 problem causes to 170 for the non-preferred client group. Only one problem cause category, self conflict, received equal responses from the two groups. The lack of self information category was selected by 42 ideal clients to 17 non-preferred clients. Lack of environmental information was also selected more times by the ideal client group (61 to 40), while the non-preferred client group most often selected the conflict with others (47 to 26) and the lack of skill (41 to 30) categories (see Table 23).

## TABLE 21

## THE SIMILARITY OF COUNSELOR-CLIENT AGREEMENT ON PROBLEM CATEGORIES BETWEEN EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELORS AND THEIR TWO CLIENT GROUPS

| Counselor Number | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Similarity | Middle Similarity | Dissimilarity | Similarity | Middle Similarity | Dissimilarity |
| 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 3 |
| 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 |
| 4 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 |
| 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 |
| 7 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 8 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 |
| 9 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 |
| 10 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 3 |
| Totals | 28 | 60 | 12 | 26 | 58 | 16 |

## TABLE 22

## 2 X 3 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE SIMILARITY OF COUNSELOR-CLIENT AGREEMENT ON PROBLEM CATEGORIES BETWEEN THE COUNSELORS AND THEIR TWO CLIENT GROUPS

| Significance Level | Similarity<br>NS | | Middle Similarity<br>NS | | Dissimilarity<br>NS | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 27 | 28 | 59 | 60 | 14 | 12 | 100 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 27 | 26 | 59 | 58 | 14 | 16 | 100 |
| Totals | | 54 | | 118 | | 28 | 200 |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

## TABLE 23

## PROBLEM CAUSE CATEGORIES SELECTED BY THE CLIENTS IN EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELORS' TWO CLIENT GROUPS

Problem Cause Categories

| Counselor Number | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 6 |
| 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4 | 6 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4 |
| 6 | 3 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 5 |
| 7 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| 8 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 |
| 9 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| 10 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 |
| Totals | 42 | 61 | 22 | 26 | 30 | 17 | 40 | 25 | 47 | 41 |

Code:

1—Lack of self information
2-Lack of environmental information
3-Self conflict
4-Conflict with others
5-Lack of skill

In checking for the significance of the differences between the two client groups on their perceptions of the problem causes, a $X^2$ value of 24.1 was obtained and found to be significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. Thus, the hypothesis (difference between the two client groups of perceptions of problem causes are equal to zero) was rejected. Table 24 presents the expected and observed frequencies for the five problem cause categories in a 2 x 5 contingency table.

Counselors checked a total of 144 problem causes for their ideal clients and 181 for their non-preferred clients. Biggest differences between the two client groups in the counselors' perceptions of problem causes occurred in the following three categories: lack of environmental information (ideal clients--45, non-preferred clients--16); self conflict (ideal clients--26, non-preferred clients--57); and conflict with others (ideal clients--19, non-preferred clients--60). The two remaining categories of lack of self-information and lack of skill received approximately the same response (see Table 25).

A $X^2$ value of 41.8 was obtained in checking the significance of differences between the two client groups on the counselors' perceptions of their clients' problem causes. The $X^2$ value is significant at the .001 level of confidence indicating that the hypothesis positing no group differences on this dimension would be rejected. The 2 x 5 contingency table showing expected and observed frequencies for the counselors' perceptions for each problem cause category is presented in Table 26.

Agreement between counselors and their clients was not so apparent with the problem cause dimension as it was on the problem type. Therefore, the data were further analyzed to determine whether counselor-client agreement on problem cause was more prevalent in either one of the two client groups. Once again, incidences of total agreement (similarity), partial agreement (middle similarity), and total disagreement (dissimilarity) were tabulated for all 200 counselor-client dyads. Complete agreement occurred 28 times for ideal clients to 6 times for non-preferred clients. Partial agreement occurred 57 times for non-preferred clients to 45 times for ideal clients. Total disagreement occurred most often with non-preferred clients--37 to 27 (see Table 27).

The counselor-client problem cause agreement data were organized in a 2 x 3 contingency table and submitted to a $X^2$ test to determine whether or not either one of the client groups was favored with more counselor-client agreement on problem causes. A $X^2$ value of 12.6 was obtained and found to be significant at the .01 level of confidence. Thus, the hypothesis equating group differences on the counselor-client problem cause agreement dimension to zero would be rejected. The ideal client group and their counselors significantly agreed more on problem causes than did the non-preferred client group and their counselors. The 2 x 3 contingency table presenting expected and observed frequencies for counselor-client problem cause agreement is presented in Table 28.

## TABLE 24

## 2 X 5 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES FOR THE PROBLEM CAUSE CATEGORIES SELECTED BY IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| Significance Level | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | .001 | | .001 | | NS | | .001 | | .001 | | |
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 30 | 42 | 52 | 61 | 24 | 22 | 38 | 26 | 37 | 30 | 181 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 29 | 17 | 49 | 40 | 23 | 25 | 35 | 47 | 34 | 41 | 170 |
| Totals | | 59 | | 101 | | 47 | | 73 | | 71 | |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

Categories 2 and 5 contributed much less to the $X^2$ value than did categories 1 and 4.

Code:

1-Lack of self information
2-Lack of environmental information
3-Self conflict
4-Conflict with others
5-Lack of skill

## TABLE 25

### PROBLEM CAUSE CATEGORIES SELECTED BY EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELORS FOR THEIR TWO CLIENT GROUPS

Problem Cause Categories

| Counselor Number | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 9 | 4 |
| 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 5 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 2 |
| 6 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 2 |
| 7 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| 8 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| 9 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 2 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 3 |
| Totals | 26 | 45 | 26 | 19 | 28 | 23 | 16 | 57 | 60 | 25 |

Code:

1- Lack of self information
2 - Lack of environmental information
3 - Self conflict
4 - Conflict with others
5 - Lack of skill

## TABLE 26

## 2 X 5 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE THEORETICAL AND OBSERVED FREQUENCIES FOR THE PROBLEM CAUSE CATEGORIES SELECTED BY COUNSELORS FOR THEIR IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| | 1 | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Significance Level | NS | | .001 | | .001 | | .001 | | NS | | |
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 22 | 26 | 27 | 45 | 37 | 26 | 35 | 19 | 29 | 28 | 144 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 27<br>27 | 23<br>23 | 34<br>34 | 16<br>16 | 46<br>46 | 57<br>57 | 44<br>44 | 60<br>60 | 24<br>24 | 25<br>25 | 181<br>181 |
| Totals | | 49 | | 61 | | 83 | | 79 | | 53 | 325 |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency.

Code:

1- Lack of self information
2- Lack of environmental information
3- Self conflict
4- Conflict with others
5- Lack of skill

## TABLE 27

### THE SIMILARITY OF COUNSELOR-CLIENT AGREEMENT ON PROBLEM CAUSE CATEGORIES BETWEEN EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELORS AND THEIR TWO CLIENT GROUPS

| Counselor Number | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Similarity | Middle Similarity | Dissimilarity | Similarity | Middle Similarity | Dissimilarity |
| 1 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| 4 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 3 |
| 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 6 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 2 |
| 7 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 |
| 8 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 |
| 9 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 7 | 3 |
| 10 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Totals | 28 | 45 | 27 | 6 | 57 | 37 |

## TABLE 28

## 2 X 3 CONTINGENCY TABLE ($X^2$ ANALYSIS) OF THE SIMILARITY OF COUNSELOR-CLIENT AGREEMENT ON PROBLEM CAUSE CATEGORIES BETWEEN THE COUNSELORS AND THEIR TWO CLIENT GROUPS

| NS Significance Level | Similarity .01 | | Middle Similarity NS | | Dissimilarity NS | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal Clients (successful) | 17 | 28 | 51 | 45 | 32 | 27 | 100 |
| Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | 17 | 6 | 51 | 57 | 32 | 37 | 100 |
| Totals | | 34 | | 102 | | 64 | 200 |

Underlined number in each cell represents the theoretical frequency

Hypothesis 2. Counselor and client agreement on ratings of counseling outcome will be a function of the degree to which the client approaches the counselor's concept of an ideal client.

Hypothesis 2 was tested in a null hypothesis framework stating that differences between the two client groups on counseling outcome ratings are equal to zero.

Both client groups and their counselors were asked to state their perceptions of counseling outcomes by rating the counseling experience on a nine-point scale. The numbers 1, 2, and 3 on the scale denoted low counseling success or helpfulness, while numbers 4, 5, and 6 denoted minimum success or helpfulness, and numbers 7, 8, and 9 high success or helpfulness.

The comparison between client groups on counselor-client agreement on counseling outcomes was done by comparing differences between the counselors' and clients' outcome ratings for the clients in the two groups. The mean outcome rating by counselors for ideal clients was 7.2. The 7.2 counselor rating compared favorably with the ideal clients' mean rating of 7.4. The mean difference between counselor ratings for their ideal client and the ideal clients' ratings was 1.4.

On the other hand, counselors rated counseling outcome success for non-preferred clients considerably lower than the clients did. Counselors' mean rating for the non-preferred group was 2.0 while the clients' mean rating was 6.7. The mean differences between the two ratings was 4.7. The mean ratings of counselors and clients with mean differences are presented in Table 29.

### TABLE 29

### A COMPARISON OF COUNSELOR AND CLIENT MEAN COUNSELING RATINGS FOR EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELORS AND THEIR TWO CLIENT GROUPS

| Counselor Number | Ideal Clients (successful) | | | Non-preferred Clients (unsuccessful) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean Counselor Rating | Mean Client Rating | Mean Difference between Counselor and Client Rating | Mean Counselor Rating | Mean Client Rating | Mean Difference between Counselor and Client Rating |
| 1 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 7.4 | 4.4 |
| 2 | 6.4 | 7.0 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 6.7 | 5.7 |
| 3 | 6.3 | 7.2 | 1.5 | 2.2 | 6.4 | 4.2 |
| 4 | 7.5 | 7.1 | 1.2 | 3.4 | 7.6 | 4.2 |
| 5 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 5.3 | 3.9 |
| 6 | 8.4 | 8.1 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 6.6 | 5.3 |
| 7 | 6.9 | 7.3 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 5.7 | 3.1 |
| 8 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 6.3 | 4.5 |
| 9 | 7.2 | 7.6 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 6.5 | 4.6 |
| 10 | 6.9 | 8.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 8.3 | 6.8 |
| | $\overline{x} = 7.24$ | $\overline{x} = 7.45$ | $\overline{x} = 1.43$ | $\overline{x} = 2.01$ | $\overline{x} = 6.68$ | $\overline{x} = 4.67$ |

None of the 100 non-preferred clients (unsuccessful) rated counseling outcomes lower than his counselor did; however, 28 of the 100 ideal clients (successful) rated counseling success lower than their counselors did. This fact explains why the mean differences between counselor-client ratings for the ideal client group exceed differences between the means for counselors one through nine. Counselor ten's ratings didn't exceed any of his clients' ratings.

The data on counselor-client outcome rating agreement was subjected to the Mann-Whitney U Test to see if differences between counselor-client outcome ratings for the two client groups were equal to zero. Difference scores were computed for each counselor-client dyad and the individual difference scores from each counselor's non-preferred client group were compared with each difference score in the ideal client group. The value of U is equal to the number of difference scores from the ideal client group that exceeded difference scores in the non-preferred client group. In cases of ties, the value of U is increased by 0.5 of a point. By comparing for each of the 10 counselors his two client groups (each consisting of 10 clients), it would be possible to obtain a U value ranging from 0 to 100. Chance expectation would place the U value in the neighborhood of 50. U values for each of the 10 outcome rating comparisons between counselors and their two client groups are presented in Table 30. U values for all the counselors (and their groups), except for counselor number five, were significant at the .01 level of confidence. Counselor number five (and his two groups) had a U value of 27 which was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, the hypothesis, indicating differences between the two client groups on counselor-client rating agreement to be zero, would be rejected. Agreement between the counselor and the client on counseling outcome appears to be related to client idealness as it is defined in the counselor's perception of counseling success. Apparently the non-preferred clients were noting benefits from counseling that counselors either failed to see or hesitated to label as positive counseling outcomes.

Hypothesis 3. Ideal clients will view counseling as helpful while non-preferred clients will see it as being not helpful.

Hypothesis 3 was tested under the null hypothesis stating that differences between the two client groups on their ratings of counseling helpfulness would be equal to zero.

As noted above, ratings by ideal clients on counseling helpfulness or success averaged 7.5 on a nine-point scale while ratings by non-preferred clients averaged 6.7 (see Table 29). The two group means were submitted to a T test with the result being that the 0.8 point difference between the mean ratings of the two groups proved to be significant. The critical ratio or T value of 3.10 that was found proved to be significant at the .01 level of confidence. Therefore, the hypothesis positing no difference between the two client groups on ratings of counseling helpfulness was rejected. We therefore conclude that client idealness, as defined in this study, is related to the client's perception of counseling outcome success in that ideal and non-preferred clients were differentiated by their ratings of counseling helpfulness.

Hypothesis 4. Ideal client types will tend to manifest personality characteristics on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator that are more similar to their counselor's than will non-preferred clients.

## TABLE 30

### MANN-WHITNEY U TEST INDICATING THE DEGREE OF COUNSELOR-CLIENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN EACH OF THE TEN COUNSELORS AND THEIR TWO CLIENT GROUPS ON COUNSELING OUTCOME RATINGS

| Counselor Number | U Values For Mann-Whitney Test | Total* | Significance Level |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .5 + .5 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 | 1.0 | .01 |
| 2 | .5 + .5 + 0 + .5 + 1 + 1 + .5 + 1 + 0 + 1 | 6.0 | .01 |
| 3 | 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + .5 + 1.5 + 3.5 + 1.5 + 8.5 + 0 | 15.5 | .01 |
| 4 | .1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 3.5 + 1 + 1 + 1 +1 | 12.5 | .01 |
| 5 | 0 + 0 + 3 + 0 + 5 + 3 + 8 + 8 + 0 + 0 | 27.0 | .05 |
| 6 | 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 | 0.0 | .01 |
| 7 | 0 + 2.5 + .5 + 0 + 0 + 2.5 + .5 + 9 + 0 + 2.5 | 17.5 | .01 |
| 8 | 7 + .5 + 1 + .5 + 2.5 + .5 + 2.5 + 0 + 1.5 + 1.5 | 17.5 | .01 |
| 9 | 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 9 + 0 | 9.0 | .01 |
| 10 | 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 | | |

* Lowest totals indicate highest levels of agreement between the counselor and his ideal client group. A total approaching 50 would indicate chance agreement between the counselor and his ideal client group

Hypothesis 4 was tested under the null hypothesis stating that differences in counselor-client personality similarity between the two client groups would be equal to zero.

Both client groups and their counselors were tested on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) to determine whether or not subjects in one of the client groups had more overall personality similarity to that of their counselors than did subjects in the other client group. The MBTI consists of four scales and all four were utilized in the study. They are: Extroversion-Introversion (E-I), Sensing-Intuition (S-N), Thinking-Feeling (T-F), and Judgment-Perception (J-P). Following the test administration and scoring, the scores were converted into continuous scale scores which allow, for example, separate (E) and (I) scores to be treated as a composite EI score, etc. Then, each student's four scores were subtracted from those of his counselor and these difference scores for the two client groups were compared for significant differences. Tables 31 through 40 present the MBTI scores for each counselor and his 10 ideal and 10 non-preferred clients.

A two-way analysis of variance was used to determine whether or not counselor-client difference scores on the four MBTI scales were different for the two client groups. For the Extroversion-Introversion scale, an F ratio of 3.901 was obtained and found to be significant beyond the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, the null hypothesis equating the differences between the two client groups to zero was rejected. Interaction effects were not found to be significant (F ratio of 0.499), therefore making it possible to use the interaction mean square value as the error term in computing the F ratio for the main effect. As noted in Tables 31-40, counselors' scores varied considerably on the MBTI. An F ratio of 69.951 (significant beyond .01) for counselor effect points out the large amount of variance on the EI dimension within the group of 10 counselors. The analysis of variance table for the Extroversion-Introversion dimension is presented in Table 41.

An F ratio of 0.207 was found in analyzing possible differences between the two client groups on the Sensing-Intuition scale. Such a low F ratio does not approach significance and, therefore, requires acceptance of the null hypothesis equating group differences on this dimension to zero. Interaction effects between counselor and counseling outcome (client idealness) were also not significant (F ratio = 1.2 = 1.200). Once again large differences appeared among counselors. The F ratio of 17.370 for counselor differences was significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. The analysis of variance data for the Sensing-Intuition scale is presented in Table 42.

An F ratio of 0.077 was found in testing for differences between ideal and non-preferred client types on the Thinking-Feeling dimension of the MBTI. With a minimum F ratio of 3.84 necessary for significance at the .05 level of confidence, the hypothesis attributing only chance

## TABLE 31

### MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER L AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 1 | 67 | 143 | 131 | 161 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 65 | 113 | 93 | 139 |
| 2 | 79 | 67 | 91 | 63 |
| 3 | 59 | 149 | 93 | 133 |
| 4 | 67 | 131 | 81 | 125 |
| 5 | 125 | 143 | 91 | 99 |
| 6 | 119 | 75 | 95 | 78 |
| 7 | 69 | 61 | 121 | 87 |
| 8 | 113 | 55 | 75 | 133 |
| 9 | 97 | 75 | 125 | 119 |
| 10 | 91 | 83 | 125 | 127 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 101 | 111 | 123 | 137 |
| 2 | 81 | 115 | 133 | 119 |
| 3 | 97 | 109 | 121 | 109 |
| 4 | 69 | 141 | 91 | 159 |
| 5 | 131 | 117 | 93 | 117 |
| 6 | 49 | 117 | 147 | 127 |
| 7 | 55 | 69 | 129 | 83 |
| 8 | 81 | 141 | 61 | 149 |
| 9 | 129 | 59 | 101 | 139 |
| 10 | 123 | 147 | 67 | 147 |

Code:

EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 32

## MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER 2 AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 2 | 75 | 79 | 103 | 107 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 119 | 81 | 127 | 123 |
| 2 | 95 | 101 | 107 | 147 |
| 3 | 59 | 113 | 85 | 161 |
| 4 | 93 | 85 | 87 | 97 |
| 5 | 89 | 111 | 93 | 107 |
| 6 | 107 | 59 | 93 | 129 |
| 7 | 131 | 117 | 73 | 109 |
| 8 | 67 | 143 | 105 | 73 |
| 9 | 79 | 87 | 123 | 105 |
| 10 | 127 | 81 | 115 | 65 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 67 | 71 | 97 | 65 |
| 2 | 79 | 63 | 85 | 147 |
| 3 | 103 | 67 | 87 | 137 |
| 4 | 103 | 67 | 123 | 85 |
| 5 | 63 | 113 | 69 | 99 |
| 6 | 119 | 63 | 85 | 99 |
| 7 | 93 | 115 | 113 | 121 |
| 8 | 97 | 89 | 139 | 139 |
| 9 | 135 | 101 | 125 | 141 |
| 10 | 87 | 61 | 113 | 77 |

Code:

EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 33

## MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER 3 AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 3 | 105 | 99 | 105 | 97 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 63 | 85 | 93 | 89 |
| 2 | 99 | 101 | 97 | 135 |
| 3 | 103 | 61 | 115 | 81 |
| 4 | 119 | 75 | 97 | 133 |
| 5 | 115 | 83 | 83 | 103 |
| 6 | 61 | 137 | 79 | 83 |
| 7 | 57 | 139 | 79 | 135 |
| 8 | 89 | 75 | 119 | 73 |
| 9 | 55 | 57 | 127 | 155 |
| 10 | 81 | 95 | 101 | 87 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 47 | 133 | 127 | 159 |
| 2 | 73 | 93 | 101 | 107 |
| 3 | 119 | 73 | 105 | 111 |
| 4 | 95 | 61 | 105 | 79 |
| 5 | 61 | 93 | 117 | 75 |
| 6 | 123 | 85 | 97 | 107 |
| 7 | 119 | 71 | 125 | 119 |
| 8 | 83 | 89 | 115 | 113 |
| 9 | 87 | 75 | 85 | 101 |
| 10 | 71 | 77 | 87 | 125 |

Code:

EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 34

## MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER 4 AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 4 | 121 | 107 | 115 | 75 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 123 | 111 | 69 | 73 |
| 2 | 57 | 97 | 61 | 93 |
| 3 | 63 | 95 | 131 | 125 |
| 4 | 115 | 73 | 83 | 85 |
| 5 | 145 | 39 | 79 | 49 |
| 6 | 95 | 93 | 69 | 109 |
| 7 | 61 | 97 | 111 | 135 |
| 8 | 113 | 65 | 79 | 101 |
| 9 | 55 | 101 | 139 | 91 |
| 10 | 113 | 73 | 129 | 85 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 95 | 109 | 89 | 87 |
| 2 | 107 | 59 | 125 | 109 |
| 3 | 75 | 125 | 85 | 109 |
| 4 | 73 | 73 | 109 | 131 |
| 5 | 67 | 59 | 91 | 71 |
| 6 | 63 | 75 | 125 | 121 |
| 7 | 95 | 95 | 121 | 99 |
| 8 | 77 | 111 | 85 | 101 |
| 9 | 93 | 131 | 137 | 123 |
| 10 | 73 | 101 | 95 | 141 |

Code:

EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 35

## MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER 5 AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 5 | 57 | 139 | 77 | 113 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 49 | 85 | 137 | 83 |
| 2 | 49 | 101 | 123 | 149 |
| 3 | 101 | 93 | 87 | 57 |
| 4 | 115 | 89 | 113 | 111 |
| 5 | 149 | 141 | 83 | 101 |
| 6 | 119 | 119 | 53 | 73 |
| 7 | 111 | 89 | 107 | 145 |
| 8 | 119 | 77 | 113 | 67 |
| 9 | 95 | 77 | 109 | 59 |
| 10 | 91 | 129 | 105 | 145 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 83 | 77 | 107 | 85 |
| 2 | 87 | 51 | 83 | 65 |
| 3 | 115 | 101 | 77 | 111 |
| 4 | 65 | 69 | 105 | 85 |
| 5 | 117 | 95 | 119 | 149 |
| 6 | 91 | 129 | 79 | 137 |
| 7 | 87 | 87 | 127 | 83 |
| 8 | 95 | 147 | 113 | 157 |
| 9 | 75 | 89 | 109 | 75 |
| 10 | 67 | 61 | 97 | 101 |

Code:

EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 36

## MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER 6 AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 6 | 71 | 117 | 61 | 71 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 129 | 93 | 101 | 85 |
| 2 | 65 | 77 | 89 | 87 |
| 3 | 103 | 97 | 105 | 131 |
| 4 | 91 | 59 | 89 | 131 |
| 5 | 109 | 111 | 101 | 97 |
| 6 | 55 | 105 | 59 | 109 |
| 7 | 63 | 73 | 67 | 117 |
| 8 | 103 | 75 | 129 | 155 |
| 9 | 129 | 79 | 103 | 99 |
| 10 | 91 | 77 | 95 | 89 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 81 | 83 | 95 | 67 |
| 2 | 79 | 89 | 93 | 125 |
| 3 | 101 | 99 | 103 | 103 |
| 4 | 79 | 67 | 97 | 85 |
| 5 | 95 | 71 | 69 | 69 |
| 6 | 71 | 85 | 103 | 109 |
| 7 | 111 | 79 | 71 | 113 |
| 8 | 89 | 75 | 91 | 93 |
| 9 | 85 | 57 | 61 | 77 |
| 10 | 93 | 133 | 93 | 131 |

Code:

EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 37

## MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER 7 AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 7 | 141 | 85 | 63 | 91 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 91 | 77 | 133 | 95 |
| 2 | 63 | 99 | 113 | 111 |
| 3 | 117 | 85 | 71 | 93 |
| 4 | 139 | 75 | 129 | 131 |
| 5 | 103 | 89 | 69 | 95 |
| 6 | 95 | 83 | 77 | 117 |
| 7 | 65 | 117 | 79 | 73 |
| 8 | 55 | 85 | 69 | 49 |
| 9 | 95 | 79 | 79 | 99 |
| 10 | 93 | 73 | 85 | 101 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 63 | 147 | 95 | 153 |
| 2 | 103 | 105 | 97 | 83 |
| 3 | 83 | 137 | 121 | 145 |
| 4 | 113 | 85 | 107 | 91 |
| 5 | 65 | 119 | 127 | 127 |
| 6 | 139 | 57 | 87 | 67 |
| 7 | 141 | 101 | 95 | 141 |
| 8 | 71 | 113 | 63 | 127 |
| 9 | 117 | 85 | 107 | 115 |
| 10 | 77 | 99 | 111 | 89 |

Code:
EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 38

## MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER 8 AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 8 | 125 | 137 | 117 | 77 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 95 | 87 | 97 | 115 |
| 2 | 115 | 87 | 141 | 91 |
| 3 | 61 | 89 | 101 | 63 |
| 4 | 113 | 113 | 131 | 95 |
| 5 | 123 | 59 | 125 | 131 |
| 6 | 107 | 107 | 63 | 65 |
| 7 | 95 | 111 | 87 | 83 |
| 8 | 91 | 95 | 119 | 109 |
| 9 | 65 | 125 | 121 | 117 |
| 10 | 101 | 71 | 117 | 97 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 55 | 131 | 123 | 155 |
| 2 | 141 | 69 | 103 | 111 |
| 3 | 83 | 69 | 91 | 97 |
| 4 | 47 | 151 | 85 | 155 |
| 5 | 55 | 69 | 63 | 75 |
| 6 | 93 | 103 | 85 | 145 |
| 7 | 87 | 79 | 77 | 97 |
| 8 | 61 | 61 | 109 | 83 |
| 9 | 87 | 119 | 121 | 101 |
| 10 | 93 | 69 | 113 | 89 |

Code:

EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 39

## MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER 9 AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 9 | 77 | 95 | 87 | 47 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 145 | 73 | 69 | 73 |
| 2 | 77 | 75 | 85 | 141 |
| 3 | 63 | 101 | 97 | 55 |
| 4 | 107 | 123 | 89 | 125 |
| 5 | 67 | 83 | 99 | 47 |
| 6 | 105 | 129 | 99 | 137 |
| 7 | 123 | 107 | 111 | 111 |
| 8 | 97 | 103 | 83 | 121 |
| 9 | 67 | 91 | 121 | 103 |
| 10 | 55 | 101 | 133 | 97 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 87 | 103 | 79 | 97 |
| 2 | 65 | 105 | 97 | 73 |
| 3 | 109 | 69 | 111 | 115 |
| 4 | 97 | 93 | 87 | 93 |
| 5 | 71 | 151 | 99 | 115 |
| 6 | 83 | 101 | 93 | 123 |
| 7 | 79 | 61 | 95 | 83 |
| 8 | 79 | 93 | 115 | 133 |
| 9 | 77 | 89 | 99 | 95 |
| 10 | 55 | 89 | 71 | 73 |

Code:

EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 40

## MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR SCORES FOR COUNSELOR NUMBER 10 AND HIS IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

| MBTI Scales | EI | SN | TF | JP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Counselor Number 10 | 53 | 139 | 117 | 107 |
| Ideal Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 71 | 67 | 107 | 61 |
| 2 | 109 | 71 | 121 | 53 |
| 3 | 97 | 65 | 93 | 101 |
| 4 | 115 | 55 | 103 | 109 |
| 5 | 71 | 103 | 77 | 119 |
| 6 | 75 | 67 | 93 | 125 |
| 7 | 97 | 85 | 87 | 101 |
| 8 | 67 | 111 | 119 | 85 |
| 9 | 129 | 79 | 111 | 111 |
| 10 | 109 | 79 | 137 | 137 |
| Non-preferred Clients | | | | |
| 1 | 127 | 81 | 115 | 87 |
| 2 | 107 | 87 | 81 | 93 |
| 3 | 91 | 109 | 79 | 93 |
| 4 | 73 | 123 | 129 | 143 |
| 5 | 91 | 83 | 117 | 143 |
| 6 | 65 | 85 | 97 | 101 |
| 7 | 105 | 83 | 71 | 125 |
| 8 | 81 | 93 | 73 | 125 |
| 9 | 87 | 65 | 113 | 99 |
| 10 | 83 | 71 | 105 | 97 |

Code:

EI - Extroversion-Introversion
SN - Sensing-Intuition
TF - Thinking-Feeling
JP - Judgment-Perception

## TABLE 41

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COMPARING COUNSELOR-CLIENT SIMILARITY BETWEEN IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENT GROUPS ON THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR'S EXTROVERSION-INTROVERSION SCALE

| Source | d.f. | SS | MS | F | Significance Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Client Idealness (success) | 1 | 1152.00 | 1152.00 | 3.901 | .05 |
| Counselor | 9 | 185902.10 | 20655.780 | 69.951 | .01 |
| Interaction | 9 | 2657.59 | 295.287 | 0.499 | NS |
| Error | 180 | 106422.40 | 591.235 | | |
| Total | 199 | 296134.09 | | | |

## TABLE 42

## ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COMPARING COUNSELOR-CLIENT SIMILARITY BETWEEN IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENT GROUPS ON THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR'S SENSING-INTUITION SCALE

| Source | d.f. | SS | MS | F | Significance Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Client Idealness (success) | 1 | 141.12 | 141.120 | 0.207 | NS |
| Counselor | 9 | 106436.50 | 11826.277 | 17.370 | .01 |
| Interaction | 9 | 6128.88 | 680.988 | 1.200 | NS |
| Error | 180 | 102321.60 | 568.453 | | |
| Total | 199 | 215028.10 | | | |

differences between the two client groups was accepted. Furthermore, the F ratio of 0.840 found for the interaction effect indicated that the variable was the same for all of the counselors in that the interaction effect was not significant. The F ratio of 25.860, obtained for the counselor effect, was significant beyond the .01 level of confidence which pointed out the large difference among the counselors on the Thinking-Feeling dimension. Table 43 presents the analysis of variance breakdown on the Thinking-Feeling dimension.

In testing for group differences on the Judgment-Perception scale, the computed F ratio of 4.870 was found to be significant beyond the .05 level of confidence. Therefore, the hypothesis stating that no significant difference exists between the two client groups on Judgment-Perception would be rejected. The F ratio of 0.697 calculated for the interaction effect of counselor and client idealness (outcome success) was not significant. Therefore, the variable was consistent among the counselors. The F ratio of 27.340, significant beyond the .01 level of confidence, found for counselor effect indicates that counselors as a group varied as widely on the Judgment-Perception scale as they did on the three other Myers-Briggs Type Indicator sub-scales. The analysis of variance results for the Judgment-Perception scale are presented in Table 44.

Overall results of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator pointed to counselor-client personality similarity for ideal clients on two of the four dimensions: Extroversion-Introversion and Judgment-Perception. No group differences between ideal and non-preferred clients were found to exist on the Sensing-Intuition and Thinking-Feeling scales. Therefore, hypothesis 4 would be accepted for two phases of the personality assessment and rejected for the other two.

Interview comments by ideal and non-preferred clients are presented in the Appendices. Appendix C presents a table depicting clients' perceptions of the counselor's job. Appendix D presents favorable comments by the clients on why counseling was helpful; clients' suggestions and constructive criticism for improving counseling are listed in Appendix E. A table listing the counselors' primary criteria for counseling success and failure is also presented in Appendix F.

## TABLE 43

### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COMPARING COUNSELOR-CLIENT SIMILARITY BETWEEN IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENT GROUPS ON THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR'S THINKING-FEELING SCALE

| Source | d.f. | SS | MS | F | Significance Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Client Idealness (success) | 1 | 32.0 | 32.0 | 0.077 | NS |
| Counselor | 9 | 81280.1 | 9031.122 | 25.860 | .01 |
| Interaction | 9 | 3143.2 | 349.244 | 0.840 | NS |
| Error | 180 | 75099.2 | 417.217 | | |
| Total | 199 | 159554.5 | | | |

## TABLE 44

### ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COMPARING COUNSELOR-CLIENT SIMILARITY BETWEEN IDEAL AND NON-PREFERRED CLIENT GROUPS ON THE MYERS-BRIGGS TYPE INDICATOR'S JUDGMENT-PERCEPTION SCALE

| Source | d.f. | SS | MS | F | Significance Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Client Idealness (success) | 1 | 2457.00 | 2457.00 | 4.870 | .05 |
| Counselor | 9 | 124244.56 | 13804.95 | 27.340 | .01 |
| Interaction | 9 | 4543.64 | 504.84 | 0.697 | NS |
| Error | 180 | 130418.10 | 724.55 | | |
| Total | 199 | 261657.16 | | | |

# CHAPTER V

# SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Summary

The purpose of the study was to examine counselors' perceptions of the types of clients with whom they feel they are most effective and least effective, and thus label as ideal and non-preferred people to counsel. Central to the study were attempts to answer several questions about counselors' biases about client types: (1) Do school counselors hold well-developed, systematized biases regarding the client type with whom they most prefer to work and, if so, does a particular client type emerge as a favorite of most counselors? (2) Assuming the existence of ideal clients, what types of students and how many comprise the non-preferred client group? (3) Considering the question of proportionate numbers of ideal to non-preferred clients, how many students lack the opportunity to talk with a counselor who shares at least some commonality of interest with them, and who also prefers them as clients? and (4) Do counselors come from a rather narrow range of backgrounds and value orientations? If so, perhaps many students are excluded from the counselors' ideal client groups.

Following the identification of ideal and non-preferred client types, an attempt was made to compare the two client types for possible differences or factors that either inhibit or facilitate the achievement of counseling gains.

The specific areas of inquiry dealt with the following five strategies designed to answer the above questions:

(1) the identification of ideal and non-preferred clients using counseling success and failure as criteria;

(2) the examination of the nature of ideal and non-preferred clients to ascertain the ways in which they are similar and dissimilar;

(3) the comparison of counselor-client personality similarity with client idealness to determine the effect of this dimension on the counselor's choice of successful counseling cases (ideal clients);

(4) the measurement of counselor-client agreement on (a) the nature of the counseling problem, (b) the cause of the counseling problem, and (c) the degree of counseling success experienced, to determine the relationship of counselor-client agreement to client idealness; and

(5) the comparison between the two client groups on the ratings of the value of counseling to ascertain whether the client's perception of his counselor's effectiveness or ineffectiveness relates to his inclusion in or exclusion from the ideal client group.

The procedures involved in the implementation of the above five strategies included selection of the subjects, personal interviews with each subject, testing each subject, the analysis of each subject's grade-point average, and an intelligence test score. Each of the 10 counselors participating in the study listed their 10 most successful clients and 10 least successful clients whom they had interviewed at least four times during the school year. In addition, the counselors selected two alternate clients for each group to substitute if needed. Ideal client was defined in the study as a client who is perceived by his counselor as having experienced a high degree of counseling success. Conversely, the non-preferred client was defined as a student who is perceived by his counselor as having experienced very little or no counseling success.

For each of the 200 clients selected by the counselors, the counselors were asked to indicate their perceptions of the client's problem type, the problem cause, the degree of counseling success experienced, and the criteria they used for counseling success or failure. The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator was administered to each counselor and each client. In addition, a grade point average for each client was computed from his permanent record which also was the source of the client's Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability score. Following completion of the MBTI, each client was interviewed on his perceptions of the value of counseling, the problem type, the problem cause, and the nature of the counselor's job. The clients were also asked to make any suggestions they might care to offer in order to improve counseling. Data on the client's future plans, his curriculum type, and his parents' occupations were also collected in the interview.

To ensure minimum competence and training levels, only certified, master's degree counselors with at least three years experience were used in the study. To ensure for normality in the client population, only schools having overall equal representation of several types were selected for the study. For example, the schools all had significant numbers of college bound, vocational, and general program students enrolled in their programs. Another control on client selection originated in the use of one male and one female counselor in each of the five participating schools to ensure equal opportunities for both sexes to be chosen as clients for the study.

The null hypothesis tested in the study stated that differences between the two client groups on the following items are equal to zero:

(a) grade point average,
(b) intelligence test scores,
(c) curriculum type,
(d) future plans,
(e) Counselor-client sex matching,
(f) parents' occupational levels (including the number of mothers employed outside the home),
(g) client's perception of the problem,
(h) counselor's perception of the problem,
(i) counselor-client agreement on the problem type,
(j) client's perception of the problem cause,
(k) counselor's perception of the problem cause,
(l) counselor-client agreement on the problem cause,
(m) ratings of the value of counseling,
(n) counselor-client agreement on the ratings of the value of counseling, and
(o) similarity with their counselors on the four MBTI scales.

The data were analyzed by four different statistical tests. Group differences on grade-point averages, intelligence test scores, and the MBTI scales were assessed by submitting these data to a two-way analysis of variance test, programmed on an MR 90 program, and processed on an IBM 7094 computer. Data collected on items 'c' through 'i' were presented in contingency tables and submitted to $X^2$ analyses. Group ratings of the value of counseling were tested for difference by the critical ratio or T test, while group differences on counselor-client agreement on the value of counseling were determined through utilization of the Mann-Whitney U Test.

## Findings

The findings of the study are presented in the order that the hypotheses were tested. Considerable difference between the ideal and non-preferred client group were found on grade point average. The mean grade point average for ideal clients was 2.04 as compared to 1.26 for non-preferred clients. The difference is significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

A lesser difference was found between the two client groups on the Henmon-Nelson Test of Mental Ability. Ideal clients had an average intelligence quotient score of 104 as compared to 100 for non-preferred clients, a difference that was found to be significant at the .07 level of confidence.

The curriculum types in which the clients were enrolled varied considerably between the ideal and non-preferred client groups. Ideal clients were mostly enrolled in college preparatory programs while non-preferred clients were mostly congregated in general programs, consistting of both regular and modified classes. These differences were significant beyond the .001 level of confidence. The two client groups each had 20% of its group enrolled in vocational programs.

Future plans revealed by the clients in each group indicated differences existing between the two groups on those planning to attend college (44 ideal clients to 24 non-preferred clients), and those planning to go into business for themselves (7 non-preferred clients to 1 ideal client). These differences were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence.

Sex matching differences between the two client groups varied according to the sex of the counselor. Male counselors rated proportionately more female than male clients as being ideal. Of the 23 female clients selected by male counselors for both client groups, 17 were listed as being ideal or successful clients. The expected frequency in the contingency table $X^2$ analysis was 11.5 for female clients. In the same vein, fewer than the expected number of male clients were selected as ideal (38.5 expected to 33 observed). The differences between male and female clients selected by female counselors were not significant. Observed frequencies for female and male clients in the female counselors' selected group varied 3.5 points from expected frequencies in each cell.

Combining the clients of both male and female counselors for purposes of observing if one sex is favored over the other in the ideal client group, it was found that proportionately more females than males were selected as ideal clients. The expected frequency of 33 female ideal clients was exceeded by an observed frequency of 42, while the expected frequency of 67 male non-preferred clients exceeded the observed frequency of 58. These differences were significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Differences existing between the two client groups on parents' occupational levels and the number of mothers working outside the home were tested for significance by a $X^2$ test. Group differences were found to exist at the semi-professional and managerial level (lower) in which 30 parents of ideal clients and 16 parents of non-preferred clients were classified. Group differences were also noted in the semi-skilled category which contained 15 parents of non-preferred clients as compared with 5 parents of ideal clients. The differences were significant at the .02 level of confidence. No group differences were noted in the number of mothers working outside the home. The ideal client groups had 53 mothers in some type of employment, while 51 mothers in the non-preferred client group were employed. No group differences were found on the number of parents employed in the following levels: professional and managerial, higher; professional and managerial, regular; skilled; and unskilled.

The nature of the problems brought to counseling interviews by both client groups was analysed from three vantage points. First, differences between the two client groups on the problem categories checked were analyzed. Second, this was followed by a comparison between the two groups on the types of client problems that were perceived by the counselor. Third, an analysis was made of differences between the two groups on the amount of counselor-client agreement on the nature of the clients' problems. In the first analysis it was found that ideal clients selected significantly more problems in the vocational category than did non-preferred clients, while the effect was reversed for problems selected in the emotional category. These differences were significant at the .01 level of confidence. Numbers of problems in the educational category did not vary significantly between the two groups.

Counselors' perceptions of the clients' problems varied in much the same fashion as did the clients' perceptions. Counselors listed significantly more vocational problems for ideal clients and more emotional problems for non-preferred clients. Once again there were no significant differences in the number of educational problems checked for both client groups. Differences in the vocational and emotional problem categories was significant at the .001 level of confidence.

For purposes of examining further the seemingly high rate of counselor-client agreement on the counseling problem category, a $X^2$ analysis was used to test possible group differences on this dimension. Results indicated that there were no significant group differences and that the high degree of counselor-client problem category agreement was consistent for both ideal and non-preferred clients.

The causes of the clients' problems were also considered from three aspects: clients' perceptions, counselors' perceptions, and counselor-client agreement. Ideal clients selected two areas as major causes of their problems: lack of information about self and lack of information about the environment. The differences between ideal and non-preferred clients on these two problem cause categories were significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Non-preferred clients indicated that most of their problem causes were in the two areas of conflict with others and lack of skill. Once again these differences were significant at the .01 level of confidence. The problem cause category of self conflict was checked an equal number of times by both client groups.

Group differences on counselor-client agreement on the clients' problem causes were assessed through a $X^2$ analysis. Unlike the counselor-client agreement found in both client groups for the nature of counseling problems, a difference existed between the two groups on counselor-client problem cause agreement. Complete agreement on problem cause was achieved 28 times for the ideal clients to six times for non-preferred clients--a difference significant at the .01 level of confidence. Differences between the two groups on partial agreement and complete disagreement on problem causes did not contribute significantly to the $X^2$ value.

Group comparisons on ratings of counseling outcome success were analyzed from three types of data: clients' perceptions, counselors' perceptions, and counselor-client agreement. Ideal clients gave counseling outcome a mean success rating of 7.5 on a 1-9 point scale as compared with a 6.7 rating by non-preferred clients. The difference between the means was submitted to a T test with the resulting T value of 3.10 being found to be significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Counselors' ratings of outcome success necessarily varied considerably for the two client groups because counselors identified the client sample on the basis of high and low counseling success. Therefore, counselors' outcome success ratings averaged 7.2 for ideal clients and 2.0 for non-preferred clients. The point of interest in the outcome rating phase of the study was the amount of counselor-client agreement existing in the two client groups. A Mann-Whitney U Test was used to compare outcome rating differences for each counselor-client dyad in each client group. The resulting U values indicated that nine of the ten counselors consistently agreed with the ideal client group--a difference which was significant at the .01 level of confidence. The tenth counselor's agreement with the ideal client group on success ratings was also quite consistent and was found to be significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The two client groups were compared with their counselors on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to find out if one group proved to be more similar to their counselors than the other group on the four scales contained in the instrument. The two-way analysis of variance test employed in the data analysis compared the two client groups on the amount of variance existing between the scores of counselor and their clients. Results indicated that client idealness is related to counselor-client similarity on the Extroversion-Introversion scale (.05 level of confidence), and on the Judgment-Perception scale (.05 level of confidence). No relationship was found between the two client groups on client idealness and counselor-client scores on the Sensing-Intuition and Thinking-Feeling scales.

A review of the data indicates that:

(1) Hypothesis 1--stating that differences between the two client groups should equal zero on grade point average, intelligence test scores, curriculum type, future plans, sex-matching, parents' occupational levels, problem type, problem cause, and counselor-client agreement on both the problem and cause--should be rejected except for the data on counselor-client sex-matching for female counselors and for

counselor-client agreement on the nature of counseling problems where no significant differences were noted netween the two client groups.

(2) Hypothesis 2--stating that differences between the two client groups on counselor-client agreement on counseling outcomes ratings are equal to zero--was rejected. Ideal clients' ratings agree closely with their counselors' ratings while ratings by non-preferred clients vary considerably from those of their counselors.

(3) Hypothesis 3--stating that differences between the two client groups on counseling outcome ratings are equal to zero--was rejected. Ideal clients rated counseling slightly higher than non-preferred clients. The difference between the mean ratings was 0.8 (on a 9 point scale) which was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

(4) Hypothesis 4--stating that group differences between ideal and non-preferred clients on personality similarity are equal to zero--was rejected for two of the four MBTI scales and accepted for the other two. The hypothesis was rejected for the Extroversion-Introversion and Judgment-Perception scales and accepted for the Sensing-Intuition and Thinking-Feeling scales.

## Conclusions

The conclusions derived from the analysis of the data are presented as they relate to the purpose of the study. Additional inferences are directed toward answering questions raised in relationship to objectives subordinate to the purpose.

(1) Utilizing school counselors' perceptions of counseling outcome success and failure as criteria for identifying ideal and non-preferred clients, it was found that counselors' ideal and non-preferred client groups vary widely among themselves, but that group differences do exist in grade point averages, scores on intelligence tests, curriculum types, future plans, agreement with the counselor on the cause of problems, types of problems, causes of problems, the value of counseling, agreement with the counselor on the value of counseling, and on personality similarity with the counselor as measured by two of the four scales on a personality inventory. Fewer group differences were noted on parents' occupational classifications and on counselor-client sex-matching. No group differences were found on counselor-client agreement on the diagnosis of the counseling problem and on the remaining two scales of the personality inventory. Therefore, it was concluded that ideal and non-preferred clients exhibit several differences which could affect counseling outcomes.

Differences between ideal and non-preferred client types influencing counseling could be those relating to school adjustment and achievement. The ideal clients had a significantly higher point average, which indicates that they as a group are probably meeting more of the typical school success criteria than are the non-preferred clients. Students who experience conflicts with school authorities and rules may be penalized with low grades that, while not being unjustifiable, still help keep the student in a vicious cycle of school failure. These students do not improve and as such become, in the eyes of the counselor and his fellow staff members, instances of where counseling has "failed." In reality, as pointed out by the surprisingly high ratings given to counseling helpfulness by non-preferred clients, the counselor may be the only person in the building with whom the school failure is not in trouble. As indicated in the non-preferred clients' comments on the value of counseling, the counselor may be for many students the only person in the school with whom they feel free to talk (see Appendix D).

That school success plays an important role in the make up of the ideal client may be further verified by noting the criteria selected by counselors for counseling outcome success and failure (see Appendix F). School adjustment was listed 49 times and school achievement was listed 41 times. Furthermore, counseling is largely a verbal process and those students with better grades may be the ones who are most clever in manipulating verbal concepts.

The question may be raised as to why the difference in grade point average was not matched by an equally big group difference on an intelligence test which theoretically correlates highly with school performance. There was a difference of four intelligence quotient points that was significant at the .07 level of confidence, but the difference was certainly not as large as the grade-point average difference. Once again the emphasis placed on school adjustment and achievement by school counselors would seem to be the factor explaining the small difference. Many non-preferred clients were so listed because of their chronic under-achievement. Many counselors included in their non-preferred client group students having relatively high intelligence test scores and very low grades. These clients constitute evidence of the counselor's failure because the counselor has not been able to remedy the situation. Chances are that many of these under-achievers have been referred by teachers who are anxiously awaiting overnight increases in academic performance. Therefore, it would seem that low achievers with high intelligence test scores pose one of the counselor's biggest difficulties and hence, a significant portion of his non-preferred client group.

Further evidence supporting school adjustment and academic success as qualities of the school counselor's ideal client may be found in the data on curriculum type and future plans. More ideal than non-preferred clients are in college preparatory curricula and are planning to attend college. Conversely, more non-preferred clients are enrolled in general curricula.

(2) Briefly mentioned above as another difficult client for the school counselor was the student who finds himself in constant conflict with most of his teachers and often his parents and fellow classmates as well. These clients are another group that show an unusually strong resistance to rapid behavior changes that teachers expect when they make a referral. These types of problems were classified under emotional problems (checked 65 times for non-preferred clients by counselors) and as being caused by conflicts with others (checked 57 times for non-preferred clients by counselors). By constrast, these same two categories received 27 and 26 checks, respectively, for ideal clients.

(3) The data indicate that school counselors may not prefer to work with clients whose problems are primarily emotional. Counselors may be convinced that they are not sufficiently well-trained to handle their clients' emotional problems and therefore maintain a sense of emotional problem aversion in their counseling role. Their ideal clients were seen as having more vocational type problems while the non-preferred group had most of the emotional type problems. Both groups had equally large numbers of educational problems checked by their counselors. The big difference on the educational problem category apparently was that ideal clients improved and non-preferred clients did not. Further evidence for the predominance of emotional problems in the non-preferred client group may be noted in the combined total of 117 problem causes checked by their counselors in the categories of self-conflict and conflict with others.

(4) Counselor-client agreement apparently is a significant trait counselors share mostly with ideal clients; the one exception would be in correct diagnosis of the counseling problem where counselors performed equally well with both client groups. Counselor-client agreement on diagnosis of the problem cause proved to be a different story in that counselors were in complete agreement with ideal clients more often than they were with non-preferred clients. It may be inferred that counseling focusing on causes behind problems may be more critical for a productive counseling relationship than correct problem diagnosis. Therefore, problem cause agreement may contribute more to the counselor's image of client idealness.

Counselor-client agreement on the value of counseling is another event that seems to occur most often with ideal clients. Even though ideal clients tend to rate the value of counseling higher than non-preferred clients do, non-preferred clients perceive counseling as being much more helpful than their counselors do. Therefore, it appears that when counselor and client counseling expectancies are similar and that when both rate the value of counseling high, the counselor is most likely to consider the client as his ideal client type. The lack of counselor-client agreement on the value of counseling that is found with non-preferred clients and their counselors may be symptomatic of misperceptions and general low levels of understanding and communication characteristic for entire series of interviews with non-preferred clients. Obviously, non-preferred clients hold different counseling outcome success criteria than counselors do. As indicated in the clients' comments on the helpfulness of counseling (see Appendix D), many clients find the counselor to be the only person in the school with whom they are able to talk. They appreciate the warm and confidential relationship in the midst of an all too often hostile school environment. For them, these aspects of counseling are helpful and they rate the counseling experience accordingly. Their counselors, seeing no observable changes in their behavior or attitudes, rate the value of counseling low.

(5) Counselor-client similarity seems to be somewhat more characteristic of ideal clients rather than of non-preferred clients. Looking first at counselor-client similarity involved in sex-matching of the counselor and client, we may conclude that the effect appears to be more significant for male counselors than for their female counterparts. Male counselors apparently have more contact with male clients (77 to 23); however, proportionately more females than males were listed as ideal clients and conversely more than the expected number of males were listed as non-preferred clients. The female counselors followed much of the same trend as did the male counselors, but they were more balanced in their selection of male and female clients (57 to 43). Once again the tendency was to list proportionately more females than males as ideal clients; however, the differences were not significant. Combining both client groups reveals that a significantly larger proportion of females has been selected as ideal clients while the larger proportion of male clients fall into the non-preferred client group.

If problem seriousness is the criteria for non-preferred client types that it appears to be, we may conclude that male clients, more than female clients, bring serious conflict problems to counselors. Female clients with their well-developed verbal skills and less violent behavior patterns may most closely approximate the counselors' ideal client type. A case may be made for matching clients with counselors of the opposite sex in that female clients appeared more frequently than expected in the male counselors' ideal client group while male clients more closely approximated their expected frequency for the ideal client group with the female counselors.

More important to the concept of counselor-client similarity is personality similarity. Dimensional classification of counselor-client similarity on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator revealed that client idealness was related to counselor-client similarity on two of the four MBTI scales: Extroversion-Introversion and Judgment-Perception. No relationship was found between either client group on the other two scales: Sensing-Intuition and Thinking-Feeling. Therefore, the findings indicated that client idealness was related to middle similarity on the personality factor. As indicated in the review of literature, middle similarity between counselor and client may be the best match for counseling success. Too much similarity could disturb an effective balance of objectivity and empathy in the counseling relationship. In fact, the counselor could identify so thoroughly with the client and his situation that he could probe too deeply too quickly and frighten away clients who do not want to be so well-understood so early in the game. In a similar vein, too little counselor-client similarity could swing the balance too far on the objective side of the picture. Generally it could be concluded that counselor-client similarity should enhance the counseling experience by increasing the level and quality of counselor-client communication as well as building mutual interest in making counseling work.

The actual dimensional scores on the MBTI are not so important to client idealness as are the similarity scores of counselors and their clients. The EI dimension, representing ease in and liking for social contact, seems to be a significant factor in selecting ideal clients. The E type prefers to direct his mental processes toward ideal and conceptual models. An E and I mismatch between counselor and client would seem to be a rather severe detriment to the counseling process. Similarly, a mismatch between the person who uses a judging attitude in dealing with his environment with a person who uses a perceptive attitude could seriously hamper the counseling relationship. Mismatching on the J-P dimension would result in pairing a person preferring order and planning with a person preferring spontaneity and novelty. In fact, it could well be that individual client traits are of less importance in the client than are the commonalities he shares with his counselor. Theoretically, an "off beat" client would do quite well with an "off beat" counselor providing that extreme similarity did not disturb the empathy-objectivity balance.

Looking at counselor-client similarity from the aspects of background and values, we may note that school counselors are not the stereotyped group they appear to be. To be sure, they have all been through teacher education programs and have served sometimes lengthy teaching apprenticeships. However, results of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator pointed out that the 10 counselors had nine different personality profiles. The two counselors having the same general profiles did vary widely on the scales within the profile. Therefore, it would seem that school counselors are not out of the same mold and that such diversity is healthy for a counseling situation containing a wide variety of student personality types. Furthermore, the study indicated that parents' occupational levels had very little effect on whether a client was selected as an ideal or non-preferred client type--a fact indicating that the counselors are comfortable working with clients from a variety of backgrounds, albeit few came from homes where the parents were either working in semi-skilled or unskilled jobs or were unemployed.

In general it may be concluded that ideal clients seem to have certain traits non-preferred clients lack and that these traits contribute to perceived counseling outcome success. It may also be concluded that school counselors are not so selective as non-school counselors and therapists in their choices of ideal clients. In fact, the ideal client group contains a wide variety of student types as does the non-preferred client group. Furthermore, non-preferred clients are not as pessimistic as their counselors about the value of counseling. Possibly counselors do not need to base success criteria on evidence of striking behavioral change. Evidence from non-preferred clients would support this view.

(6) Failure for a firm conceptualization of an ideal client type to emerge from the data collected in the study may be open to the following three negative interpretations:

(a) school counselors do not feel comfortable about considering ideal client types because they are expected to counsel all students;

(b) school counselors tend to operate on a rather superficial level, looking only for concrete counseling gains--possibly they either have not had the opportunity or desire to think seriously about why they counsel the way they do and what types of people respond best to what types of counseling situations; or

(c) school counselors prefer not to work with emotional types of problems requiring a depth in counseling which depends heavily on client idealness and client-counselor similarity; lack of significance between the two client groups on the MBTI scales of Feeling and Intuition would support this view.

In a more positive light, it may be concluded that counselors do excellent work in the school setting with several types of students and that emergence of a particular client type as being ideal is inhibited by such items as limited success criteria and widely varying counselor personality types. It does appear that school counselors share a commonality with their clinical counterparts in that both seem to prefer to work with clients who have high possibilities for outcome success.

## Recommendations For Further Study

(1) Inquiry needs to be made into the possibilities available to the school for helping the non-preferred client who doesn't respond to conventional aids. Non-preferred clients are so labeled because they don't improve. Are certain environmental changes within the school

possible sources of help for these students who seemingly find themselves in trouble with everyone except the counselor?

(2) Research should be directed toward studying the effectiveness of reinforcement counseling used in conjunction with workstudy and special interest programs. Such behavioral counseling techniques may hold promise for the non-preferred client in making school make sense to him.

(3) Evaluation of counselor education should be made to determine whether counselor trainees receive sufficient opportunity to work with a wide variety of client types and the opportunity to think through the questions: Why do I counsel the way I do?; and, Whom do I counsel best and why?

(4) Research should be directed to the question: What effect does counselor placement based on counselor-client match have on the overall effect of a school guidance program?

(5) Finally, the present study should be followed up for purposes of delineating further client traits that enhance or inhibit the achievement of counseling gains.

# APPENDIX A

## INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR COUNSELORS

Counselor's Name______________________Sex M__F__School_______________

Problem Classifications

___1. Vocational
___2. Emotional
___3. Educational

Problem Causes

___1. Lack of self information
___2. Lack of environmental information
___3. Self conflict
___4. Conflict with others
___5. Lack of skill

Success Rating of Counseling:

1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9

| Low Success | Medium Success | High Success |
|---|---|---|

List of 12 most successful clients:

| | Name | Grade | Problem Classification | Problem Cause | Success Rating | Criteria for Success or Reason for Choice |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | | | | | | |
| 2. | | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | | |
| 4. | | | | | | |
| 5. | | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | | |
| 7. | | | | | | |
| 8. | | | | | | |
| 9. | | | | | | |

10.

11.

12.

List of 12 most unsuccessful clients:

|  | Name | Grade | Problem Classification | Problem Cause | Success Rating | Criteria for lack of Success or Reason for Choice |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX B

## INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR CLIENTS

Client's Name____________________ Grade____________ School____________

Sex M___F___

Age_________

Success Rating of Counseling:

1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9

| Not Helpful | Medium Helpful | Very Helpful |
|---|---|---|

Problem Classification

___1. Vocational

___2. Emotional

___3. Educational

Problem Cause

___1. Lack of self information

___2. Lack of environmental information

___3. Self conflict

___4. Conflict with others

___5. Lack of skill

Comments on the counseling experience:

(a) Why or why not was counseling helpful?

(b) What do you think the counselor's job is?

(c) What improvements or suggestions do you have?

Curriculum type:

___1. College Prep

___2. Vocational

___3. General

Future Plans:

Parents' Occupation

Father____________

Mother____________

## APPENDIX C

## CLIENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE COUNSELOR'S JOB

| Job | Ideal Clients | Non-preferred Clients | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| The counselor helps you with your problems. | 37 | 40 | 77 |
| The counselor helps you by putting himself in your place and seeing your side of the story, just talking it over with the counselor who understands you helps. | 21 | 22 | 43 |
| The counselor gives advice and guidance and helps you with decisions. | 21 | 22 | 43 |
| The counselor plans class schedules. | 20 | 14 | 34 |
| The counselor helps keep students in school and to adjust to the school situation. | 9 | 13 | 22 |
| The counselor helps you get a job with workstudy programs in the neighborhood youth corps. | 8 | 7 | 15 |
| The counselor helps you to prepare for the future. | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| The counselor helps interpret your abilities to you and helps you to find out what you are best qualified to do. | 7 | 6 | 13 |
| The counselor helps you with your schoolwork. | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| The counselor helps mediate between students and others (parents, faculty, and administration). | 4 | 8 | 12 |
| The counselor helps get you into college. | 7 | 0 | 7 |

| Job | Ideal Clients | Non-preferred Clients | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| The counselor's job is not clear to me. | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| The counselor handles the testing program. | 3 | 0 | 3 |

# APPENDIX D

## FAVORABLE COMMENTS ABOUT THE COUNSELOR AND COUNSELING BY IDEAL CLIENTS

---

The counselor showed me what to take (Mechanics). They kind of put themselves in your place.

Grades improved about one letter.

Having someone to talk with who is half-way intelligent is good.

Found out some information about myself--about possible careers.

The counselor helps prepare you for the future. He considers your interest and grades and has more realistic expectations for you--sometimes expectations (of others) are too high.

The counselor helped me make a decision to go to college. I thought it was a place for geniuses; the counselor encouraged me to go to college. We selected appropriate high school subjects for college.

The counselor usually made me feel better.

The counselor helped me to consider others' feelings and to look at possible outcomes of my action.

The counselor comes to you. Counselors are pretty perceptive about your feelings.

The counselor explained schedule until it was clear. '

The counselor helped me decide what I wanted to do and to pick out strengths and weaknesses, etc.

---

The counselor helps with lessons.

Good information, good moral support, and encouragement came from the counselor. The counselor opened some doors by talking to the teachers, arranged for a tour of the OSU physics lab, and obtained some additional sources of information.

Counseling was helpful because I wanted to know what I was best suited for. I don't feel that tests are that accurate--I doubt the results.

The counselor answered some questions about future plans.

Just talking with the counselor makes me feel better. The counselor understands and is the only one on the staff I like.

The counselor helped in decision making on college and coursework, pointed out programs in the catalog, and gave me good information.

Planning my future was helpful.

I had a lot of problems--the counselor offers sympathy--just have somebody to talk to helps.

---

I liked the counselor; he was easy to talk to and acted concerned and interested.

Good follow-up and personal interest were evident.

Helped me decide on what to take course-wise.

Talked me out of dropping a lot of classes--convinced me to stay in school.

Told me the Air Force would be the best for me after school.

Gave me information on colleges. Grades have improved as a result of better study habits.

Explained everything to the fullest detail; acts real concerned about my problems and about me. Usually tells me the score--what will happen if I don't do this or that.

Understands and listens to problems, gives some suggestions some of which I take. It helps to tell problems to someone. Helps to consolidate information and plans. The counselor's how to study hints were helpful, but I didn't follow them too well.

Suggested ways of bringing up grades--I never learned to study.

Helped me get a job which was badly needed (Youth Opportunity Act).

Enlightened me on how to study--my grades came up. I also decided on a vocational choice.

Study habits were improved. The counselor tried to help me form a higher opinion of myself and helped me to decide to go to college. I am no longer scared of the idea about going to college.

Helped me get better grades by improved study methods.

---

The counselor told me to look at colleges having a strong math department, how to get scholarship aid, and how to check the rating of a college and its math department and its requirements.

Helped me to narrow college choices to one.

I could talk to the counselor--she was understanding; I felt I could trust her--this is most important to me. She was really interested in me--not phony. She had also helped my friends. Being a Negro, finding someone I can trust is most important.

Interest test was helpful. Aptitude test and DAT, were helpful. Helped narrow choices down to my strongest area for my vocational choice.

Helped me get straightened out for college, where to go etc. The counselor had a special talk with a college representative which helped me get accepted. Interest test was good.

Gave me some ideas about which way to go; gave me suggestions about certain colleges and how to start going about this process.

Helpful in explaining catalog information about college; good advice on college. "Well-founded interest in me."

Helped with home problems which were causing my grades to go down--I got a lot of encouragement and help. Got a lot of good information on scholarships and careers.

Transferred from New York where I could not get to know a counselor--you could see them only ten minutes. Here you can get to know them. I decided on a college and an occupation. Gave me material on scholarship funds.

---

Helped me decide a future vocation.

Every school system is different. I move each year and the counselor helps me work out how I can get extra credits.

Information about the college I want to go to was helpful. Counseling has helped me decide what career I want to go into.

Made me come back to school. I do lack confidence in myself.

Helped me pick a college, gave me information about the field I'm going into, and arranged for me to attend several meetings on Nursing, etc.

Helped me see the problems I've had from both sides and helped me solve my own problems; it helps to have another view.

Talked with parents and this helped out. The counselor gave me a lot of information about Nursing, etc.

Counseling made me realize what I needed to take in order to graduate and get a job. Counseling also helped me do better in one subject with which I was having trouble. They helped me revise my schedule so that I could take a background course before the difficult one.

The counselor, my teachers, and my parents got together and straightened out my algebra and chemistry problems. Got some good information about the Columbus technical schools. The counselor has been real nice and I feel free to come in with any questions.

---

Gave me a chance to talk to someone about my feelings about the problem I had.

This in itself was helpful.

It relieves a lot of pressure on a person's mind if you can tell another person about your problem. It makes you feel that you are not alone with your problem.

Figured out schedule. We are choosing best trade school for me to attend. I got a lot of information on this. Suggested work study program to me.

Helped me see what my problems were.

Some suggestions about studying were good. I tried about half of them and they helped some.

Found out a lot of things I needed to know that I couldn't have found out otherwise.

The counselor talked me into staying in school. Made school more interesting by making it possible for me to graduate (scheduling, etc.). The counselor would help me in any way he could.

Helped me make a decision about college.

Counseling gave me another opinion from one who knows more about the problem than I do.

Helped me straighten out some of my problems; helped me single out my problems.

---

I got some good information on colleges and on what schools are good.

Assisted me in making a career choice and what school I should go to.

Helped me to find my own solutions instead of just making them for me.

Explained problems real nicely and had a lot of information which helped. Career materials were very helpful.

Information was good on scheduling, fees for O.S.U., grades (encouragement), and scholarship tests and careers (elem. educ. or medicine).

It was beneficial to talk with someone about the things on my mind. I made a decision on what school to attend.

The counselor was down to earth with me; didn't talk like a teacher, and instead, talked like a friend and suggested what he thought might be best.

Schedule change made better grades possible. Career choice was made.

Gave me another opinion. The counselor is older than I am, knows what he is talking about, and listens well.

Helped with college choice. Counselor is easy to talk with about other things.

---

The counselor is someone who understands your problems and will take the time to help you with them.

Helped me with eye contact problem, referred me to a junior college, and is real sweet to me.

Looked at the possibility of vocational training at Central High School --the requirements and benefits.

Helped mediate difficulties between my teachers and me.

Helped resolve a conflict with another student; helped arrange a schedule which helped avoid a teacher conflict.

Helped me get a tutor; helped me in general.

The counselor will talk to the teacher who is unreasonable about grades and generally help you out.

Counselors are truthful with you--they often mention some of their problems and you have a two-way conversation going. We both know a lot about each other.

We are honest with each other.

Helped me see the wisdom of finishing high school.

Helps students to understand their teachers and themselves. Helps students solve their problems.

---

Gave me the right schedule, encouragement, and good information.

Working for counselors in their office has given me a lot of help on how to do office work. Advice and talks have been generally good, I disagreed with the counselor about my boyfriend, though.

Helped me overcome problems both at school and at home. Helped me get my feelings settled about some difficult problems. I especially like the confidential relationship between student and counselor.

Helped in course selection and a vocational decision.

Improved my schedule--I got a better teacher.

Information helpful on requirements. If I had come earlier, I could have arranged a better schedule.

It is helpful to have someone to go to for information.

The counselor is like a friend, is helpful, and listens to problems. The counselor got me readmitted to school.

The counselor can tell me where I stand in my grades and gives suggestions on how to bring them up.

Counseling gives students a chance to express their feelings and let off steam.

Counselors are convenient and easy to see--they are in a familiar setting and are easy to talk with. Counseling helped solve my problems and helped me make a career choice. Counseling keeps students going the right way. It is also an aid to parents, a go-between for parents and teachers, and helps parents deal with teachers.

---

Gave me a lot of information.

Provides experience in helping you solve problems. Helped me get a part-time job.

Helped answer a lot of questions.

Helped me understand things better. The counselor is nice to me and helped with schedule.

The counselor straightened out my schedule which helped raise my grades.

You can take problems to them because they understand and offer good suggestions.

Helped me on future plans. Testing program has been good.

Counselor can talk with the teachers and mediate difficulties--also helps you state your case and explain your problem to them.

Helpful in course decisions. I got a part-time job through the counselor.

I have a better program and get along better with that one teacher who was pushing me too hard. The counselor took an interest in me and really helped in my subject selection.

I raised my grades because I was put in a modified program and I got a job with the counselor's help.

## FAVORABLE COMMENTS ABOUT THE COUNSELOR AND COUNSELING BY NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

Helped me decide how to work out schedule for next year. Helped grades in that my attitude changed. I felt more like working because I realized the seriousness of failing.

Nobody else to talk to about "them" teachers. Teachers don't care if you come to school or not.

Helped me finish this year. I have some trouble in school which they help me with--especially teachers, the principal, and the attendance officer. It helps just to talk it out.

Talk things over with you and helps you get along better in school.

Explained schedule.

Helped me to get through the entire year. I didn't get along with that English teacher much and it helped there. Counselor gave me study aids.

Gave information on best subjects for me to take.

Gave some good advice to future jobs.

Straightened out schedule.

---

Talked out problems about teachers--helped keep me in school.

Opened my eyes to the fact that I've got to get on the ball if I'm going to make college. Made me think more on how to get along better at home and with others. Helped make a decision about graduating and them going into service to get it over.

The counselor helped me with English, helped me make out a good class schedule, and arranged some study halls between my classes.

Helped my grades to go up. Counselor seems like a father to me--talks out problems with me.

The schedule I got from the counselor turned out to be the best I could get.

Everything the counselor told me I already knew. I did appreciate the counselor's effort in trying to help me.

Grades improved somewhat.

The counselor taught a how to study program which made me work a lot harder and settle down.

---

Kept me in school.

I found out I could take a program which would enable me to graduate sooner.

Helps me cool off when I'm mad at a teacher.

Does what she thinks is best for you and it usually is.

Causes me to think a lot, especially about some of the questions raised.

Figured out schedule--didn't help too much with teacher conflict.

Helped me decide on what subjects to take.

Worked out a study schedule and talked with my Dad about chemistry failure.

Counselors understand--try to see your side of the story and put themselves in our places. They do their best to help out and give information. Hard to explain, but they are easier to talk with (than teachers) and they have to time to do so. Showed interest in my going to college --genuinely interested in me--I get books on colleges from the counselor.

Kids are more free to talk with counselors--they trust them--would rather talk to them than parents. They don't push you into telling something, instead they try to find out how you feel.

You can express your point of view in here (counselor's office).

---

Helped me make a tentative career choice.

My schedule change may help my grades. Switching teachers should help as well as dropping world history. It helps to have someone to talk to.

Helped get a job. Change of schedule helped--another counselor wouldn't even consider it. The counselor is an easy person to talk to, especially for (the counselor's) age.

Is understanding with problems. Information on testing and college selection was helpful.

Helped with parent problem, decision on college, and helped with main interest.

This was done mainly by talking it out.

The counselor told me what to do about teacher conflict; whether I do it is another story. She seems really interested in me and I need this.

Helped talk with the math teacher in working out my problems in math--also helped in talking with my mother.

I know more about getting a job and the requirements needed after counseling.

The counselor was understanding and counseling made me enthusiastic.

Set up a study program which is starting to help out.

Stressed the importance of education--especially the importance of some distasteful courses.

Finding out the right program for graduation and getting a special course program worked out was helpful.

Put my schedule in shape to suit me.

Told me things that would help me. These things were good, but I didn't follow through.

---

Helped with a schedule change so that I could get into auto shop. Gave me some tests on reading in order to get me into a reading program.

Helped me understand the teacher's side of the story and why he graded like he did.

I was better informed after counseling, it helped me see another viewpoint.

Didn't treat me as if I were wrong--was objective in dealing with my problem--was friendly and easy to talk with--wasn't emotional about my problem like a relative would be. I also knew that my problem would be handled confidentially.

Just helped with schedule mostly.

Helped you understand yourself and other people.

The counselor was helpful, listened to me, and did the best she could on my problem of credits.

A lot of times I've gone into see the counselor when I've just felt like giving up.

Just talking with the counselor made me feel better.

---

The counselor tries to find out what you are like and then tries to help you from that--also gives good advice, but you don't take it because you don't want to do it.

Pointed out why I should study, but I can't force myself to do it. The counselor has a lot of good advice.

Talked me into college--I really hadn't planned to go. Counseling also helped me resolve a difficulty with the principal.

Helped me understand the teacher better--I didn't understand her teaching--everything was screwed up.

Helped me make the right decision; when to make them and what I had to.

It helps to talk with someone else about your problems.

Helped with schedule.

Counselor gave some answere about what I needed--had good information on jobs and Armed Forces training. The counselor is outside help, Mom and Dad just say the same thing over and over. It is good to have an outside opinion.

Listen to everything you say--like a buddy to you. He acts as a release for problems that shouldn't build up in you; you can get things off your chest. I finally had someone sit down and try to help me rather than someone who said figure it out for yourself (especially college).

Helped me in a way that best fit my needs. The counselor was quite helpful in everything I discussed.

Helps with family problems. I need to change schools. The counselor has been understanding about this and is also trying to help me find a job to contribute to family support.

Gave me an outside opinion from someone who knew what he was talking about.

Gave me good information.

Helps with decision-making; this is helpful when you are on your own.

Set me straight on graduation requirements and gave me a schedule which pretty well fits my abilities.

Helped with setting up a schedule.

The counselor is a fair person. I was persuaded to stay in school.

Understood me and told me what would be good for me in what I wanted.

Helped me get into senior choir and helped me get a beneficial schedule change which gave me a study hall before a class. This helped because I work Monday, Wednesday, and Friday nights.

Helps me in everything. I didn't get chosen for D.E. The counselor showed me where it might be best that I didn't. The counselor brought me in for some tests--I did pretty well on them. My grades started going up.

Understood me and we got along well.

Tells me ways of getting homework done.

Helped settle family dispute; talked with me about my grades.

Solved my problem.

Got me out of a history class where I couldn't get along with the teacher and put me in a class where I could. Gave me good information on IBM work.

Rearranged my schedule so that I could get a half-day job.

Helps me understand school requirements for graduation and also what subjects I'm best suited for.

Made me settle down and work on grades.

---

Schedule change was helpful.

The counselor seemed to have a deep interest in me. Helps you get a good start toward college.

Helped me graduate.

Understood me better than anyone else and gave me several alternatives when I needed to make choices.

The counselor reminds you of important things, especially if you are a sophomore.

The counselor was helpful sometimes--like telling me how to graduate.

I'm a talker and teachers don't like this--hatred builds up. I can talk to the counselor--can't talk with teachers. I can get rid of anxiety by talking to counselors. I respect their M.A. degree--they know what they are talking about.

Counselors have experience and education in helping you solve problems. You need somebody to talk to for advice.

---

Helps me see the teacher's point of view. You can tell if the counselor thinks you are right or wrong.

Helps you out by telling you what they have to offer--workwise (part-time jobs).

Helped me get along better with teachers.

Tells you what he thinks will be helpful, but he still lets us make up our own mind.

I wouldn't take real serious problems to him--just those dealing with teachers and scheduling.

Helped me work out fighting problems with other students.

Got me a Youth Corps job. I learned how to cope with others. The counseling experience was a good one. It helped me to communicate.

Gave me encouragement. Told me the importance of education.

Helped get the grades up--helped get me a part-time job in the Youth Corps.

Helped me with some of the teachers--mediated between me and the teacher.

The counselor is friendly and you have confidence in him. You can rely on him.

## APPENDIX E

## CRITICISMS OF THE COUNSELOR AND COUNSELING BY IDEAL CLIENTS

I do not think high school counselors are capable of placing themselves in your shoes. They tend to be above you; they hand you a solution and expect you to accept it. We are buddies, the counselor and I, but he hasn't helped me.

Should have more counseling time and counselors; maybe have one for every two homerooms. My sister could have used some assistance--she missed out on graduation.

Need more counselors--each homeroom should have a counselor or at least have a homeroom teacher with some counseling skills. Should be enough counselors to make people aware. Kids with problems don't go to counselors for help--they go to parents or to a favorite teacher or coach. Counselors fill out schedules and letters of failure which are mailed to parents.

Maybe students should be required to see the counselor. Some people think counselors are only for the "stupid" kids and, therefore, don't talk to them.

Counselors are not available often enough--even with an appointment.

Counselors need to be better acquainted with attitudes of teenagers. Slight conflicts to adults are heartbreakers to teens. Often they won't talk to delinquents or kids with poor backgrounds. Teens are naturally rebellious--if they have a teacher conflict and the counselor says forget it. They should have a three-way conference: counselor-teacher-student with the counselor as moderator.

Get rid of Junior High counselors--they foul you up--give wrong information.

They didn't seem concerned about what happens after school--only in school.

Do more testing for everybody.

Be less persuasive on certain subjects--don't cram it down students' throats.

Help kids with problems. Most of the time kids come in to talk and get out of study hall.

Help kids more by getting to the point sooner. Help him find his best qualities.

Some counselors should have more interest in the students--not act like it is a pain to help you.

---

When a student asks for a schedule change, this should be done. The student knows when he is not suited for a course; at least during the first six-week period of school.

Could be a little more understanding, less sermonizing. Don't give so many, "If I were you" or "If I had been you" reasons.

Counselor will talk to a student just so long, then they get tired of seeing him and they subtly communicate a desire to get rid of you. You notice this without him saying the interview is over. When I talk to a counselor I expect him to be a friend and to speak in the halls. I want him to be honest. If he doesn't want to talk with you, he should say so. Same with terminating interviews, e.g., he should say, "Well that seems to be about it."

I'd rather go to a clinic or a priest to discuss emotional problems--the school setting is too business-like.

Some counselors need to improve their information about tests--especially those required for college. Sometimes they don't seem to care about you, like they don't seem to care too much about what courses you take. Some kids are in courses they shouldn't be in.

All kids don't take advantage of counseling--they don't know what it is all about. Counselors should try to make themselves available and they should meet students in groups to inform them of counseling services. It would show interest and concern.

There is a problem in getting the students to go to the counselor. Introverts and shy people (especially girls I know) don't like to tell anyone their problem for fear that they will appear unique.

Students don't take full advantage of the counselors--they can be quite helpful and they are nice people.

It would be better if teachers and counselors worked together more closely.

Instead of us going to them, they should check records and call us in. I wouldn't have gone if Mom hadn't made the appointment. Many kids don't want to go in on their own. Counseling is really great for me--I didn't know we had counseling until this year. It seems more valuable to you if someone comes and asks to help you. I feel more free when someone asks me.

Counseling was not helpful because my decisions were pretty well made before I talked with her. I just wanted to inform her about my plans.

Kids should be warned before the junior year about what courses, tests, etc. are needed for college.

There are too many kids waiting to talk with counselors--as a result counselors don't concentrate as hard as they could if more time were available.

Need more counselors so that more kids have an opportunity to get help without having to wait a long time before the counselor can spend any time with them.

Step up the program; make students more aware--I didn't even know they existed in grade 10 and almost all of grade 11. Could put on a program once a year. My Mom pushed me in.

Should have information available about all colleges and not try to interest you in another one they happen to be familiar with.

Never used them until grade 12; students should be contacted in grades 10 and 11.

Kids need to get requirements straight for various college programs.

They need more time to counsel students--if time were available for each individual there would be more time to discuss personal problems. They seem so rushed that you sometimes feel that you are taking too much of their time. They would be able to help more on personal and family problems.

Kids need to know about counselors much earlier. Kids don't listen to announcements on the P.A. system, they need personal invitations. Counselors shouldn't wait for the kids to come to them.

Start it (counseling) earlier.

---

Counselors should understand you more.

Students should get to know counselor earlier. Counselor can't help students if he doesn't really know them.

I get confused when the counselor talks to me. A bad mistake was made when I was in junior high. I had to unnecessarily take a year over, because a mistake in my credits was made.

Counselors shouldn't always agree with you and shouldn't come up with little pat solutions or suggest things that they know won't work. Counselors should handle minor discipline problems such as truancy--maybe they could get somewhere with them.

Might be nice if we had more counselors.

I didn't feel I had any problems--I don't know why they called me in.

---

Everybody in the world should be a Christian. The counselor should be a Christian.

If they didn't work with personal problems they would have more time to give to educational and vocational concerns. You really shouldn't be that far away from parents that you can't take a personal problem to them.

Should do more about setting up workstudy programs for part-time work and school.

Students need to get to know the counselor sooner and better. Counselors should ask students to come in.

Need more counselors.

---

Counselor should call you in before it's too late to point out the importance of getting good grades in grade 9, and explain about taking all those college tests.

I didn't know enough about the purpose of these tests.

Need more counselors; counselors need more free time to counsel.

Provide even more career materials.

In junior high more stress on counseling is needed. Everyone should be called in during the ninth grade.

Counselors should be more in touch with students so that students will want to talk with them. Counselors should be open in their discussions so that they give more than their own opinion to the students. Should let the students make their own decisions on important matters. Counselor should help where help is needed.

Counselors could do more things with the students, sponsor things and be more sincere, and not just pass students through their office. (e.g., sponsor activities like dances.)

We need more counselors; they are too busy with extra duties.

We should have enough counselors so that they could spend more time with individual students.

---

Should call in students and get closer to them. Some students have never talked to a counselor--they have problems, but are afraid to approach the counselor. Counselors shouldn't just work with students who have low grades, but work with all students--we all have problems.

In junior high I couldn't go to my counselor with problems, because I had him for study hall and he was always picking on me. I also had him for school work and this made it difficult to talk about problems. Other counselors didn't show interest in me. My eye problem should have been caught in the seventh grade.

Need more counselors; more room.

Need more time to help more students.

---

Counselors should be more concerned about the individual than with the entire class. Should talk with individuals rather than to a class group.

More could be done with career conferences.

Counselor should be more familiar with the individual student and his background in order to prevent him from having to repeat courses he had in previous years.

Counselors should reach students much earlier so that better college prep courses can be arranged.

Many students have problems that are difficult to talk about and they are reluctant to come to the counselor and discuss them. Some attempt should be made to identify these students and interview them.

Need more counselors. Counselor should be given more authority so that the school could follow their recommendations. Counselors should have more prestige.

---

They got it pretty easy--easier than teachers. Just sit behind the desk and talk to students.

I would like to have an opportunity to talk once a week with a counselor.

Counselors seem to be set in their ways even before they talk to you. They are prone not to change even if they see your point of view. They need to be more flexible.

Students don't understand what the counselor can do for them. This information could be passed through students. Maybe through student leaders.

---

## CRITICISMS OF THE COUNSELOR AND COUNSELING BY NON-PREFERRED CLIENTS

Counselors shouldn't teach. They are hard to get hold of; they are here to help us with problems.

Too difficult to see the counselor; they are too busy; need full-time counselors.

Counselors should be more consistent, more reasonable, get together on their information, e.g., the requirements for a modified program.

I think they should ask us to come; some kids are kind of nervous about coming in.

They do help a lot because kids do get confused about a lot of things: planning for college, etc.

Do more schedule changing for everyone.

---

Students should be able to see counselors more often (twice a week).

Need more of them. It is hard to get to see a counselor.

They should try to contact everyone to check on schedules. Some kids who should come in, don't.

Counselors should try to go further in getting new programs instituted--like a smoking area for students having parents' permission to smoke.

Counselors should be more organized and more efficient.

Counselors should try to talk to everybody and not wait around until the kids come to them.

I am disappointed because teachers can look up your personal record--and you occasionally get wise cracks.

The counselor was trying to find an easy way out for me, but I didn't want to do it.

When a student asks for a schedule change--this should not be taken lightly; there is usually a good reason for it and generally the change should be made.

They should take students more seriously; should be trustworthy. Some counselors like my junior high counselor didn't keep information confidential, didn't believe my story, etc.

They should counsel for the student's good and on his level instead of parents' level.

Some kids are afraid to come in to see the counselor. Everybody has problems, not just the kids who have low grades or are always in trouble.

More emphasis on how to study is needed.

They should give students a chance to succeed with another teacher rather than trying to shove you into a modified program. He called me in and I didn't even go because it was no use.

Need more counselors for sophomores and juniors. There are just too many students for the amount of counselor time available.

Every counselor should be a psychologist; they should be very aware of the student's view of the real problem.

Counselors need to be more firm, less sweet, more honest, and authentic. Trying to win a popularity contest is not the right role for a counselor. Be honest with their opinion--don't be afraid to express it.

Counselors should show more interest in students. Sometimes it's like talking to a wall.

They ought be get teachers to help the kids more in their course work.

They should be able to take more time with you.

Could use more material on college planning.

Hints on how to study aren't helpful because I've done fairly well on my own method.

They should at least call everyone in--not just select a few. Many are too shy; many don't realize they need help of if they do, don't know where to get it.

Counseling should start before the 12th grade--it's too late then.

---

Tried to be helpful, but really wasn't. The counselor listened to my mother and took her side.

Tried to help, but I didn't get anything out of it--the counselor couldn't help me with the schedule I wanted--I had to go to the vice-principal.

Counselor seemed to lean a little too much on the side of the teacher.

Counselors need to be a little more open-minded. They always blame your problems on your friends when it is your fault. They tell you not to hang around with certain people. They don't really understand what goes on at home--parents give them only the good side.

They ought to have more administrative power so that you don't have to go to the principal to get a schedule changed.

Counselors should examine requirements for taking shop or vocational courses such as auto shop. Why must a student have two years of science before he can take auto shop?

They should try to understand you better and how you feel about certain people and subjects. They could do this by checking the students' background and asking their feelings.

Counselor should have more contact with students. They do a lot of things they shouldn't have to--like paper work which prevents them from seeing more students individually. Sometimes counselors seem to side more the teachers and administrators.

They should look more into the student than they do. They said that they weren't here to do that and that they are just interested in the face of the student.

They should spend more time with students. Often they are rushed for time. They could be more understanding.

---

Gives good and bad advice, but I don't listen. The counselor doesn't know the whole story. I don't need a counselor.

Stop asking me why I do things; I really am in charge of my own life. What I do is up to me only.

If you go in to see a counselor, he should kind of side with you because probably no one else is at this time. He should listen and not give a lot of opinion and argument--these things you get from everybody else.

Sometimes there is a difference in background between student and counselor.

Conflicts between them could be reduced with better understanding by both the student and the counselor.

They could do more on follow-up studies with each student--his income and amount of education. Show the relationship between education and income.

---

Sometimes they do things on their desks which indicate that they are not really listening or are not really sincere.

Counselors shouldn't keep to themselves. They should find out what's going on with students and other teachers. The shouldn't just sit in their office and expect students to come in.

Counselors shouldn't be too cut and dried, e.g., don't say, here's A and here's B, now make a choice. Students need more counselor time so the counselor can get to know them better. Counselors need better tests to judge a student's true ability. Students need more time with the counselor. Sometimes counselors tend to act more like administrators than counselors. I wish the counselor would have given me more information about my permanent record which would tell me more about myself.

I was on workstudy but I've had to find my own job--it is not a good job. I'm not getting any help with my courses. They just switched my classes which didn't do any good. They tried to get me to go to some kind of vocational school which I don't want to go to. I just want help here so that I can make something of myself.

Counselors could do more in helping students get part-time jobs.

Schools need more counselors.

Counselors should work on students' bad schedules.

Counselors should give the students the kind of help they need and work along with them--I need encouragement. Counselors could work with the teachers. It is no wonder kids quit school.

I don't want to be on the modified program. I'm tired of being shoved around these classes. They are trying to push me into vocational school. If counselors would stick to one thing and give me some time in counseling, I think I could straighten myself out.

Counselors should be able to see people more often so that they could go deeper into a person's case.

---

When schedules are made out, sophomores don't have enough information about what subjects are like, especially kids who are new in school.

The counselor is too soft with the kids and tries to use psychology on us and we turn it right around. If you go in and say I'm not going back to history class, the counselor will get it changed.

Some counselors seem old fashioned. They need to get along better with kids and understand them better.

Counselors should see certain students more often--those having the most problems.

Counselors shouldn't be too pushy about making decisions about something. I'd like additional time to think things over.

---

Counselors should let students know what they can do for them. Counselors should find out why teachers can smoke and students can't.

Counselors tell you what you have to do to graduate, like bring up your grades, which you already know. They just tell you over and over.

They just lecture on behavior, etc.

Counselors should explain things more--should give you more of an opportunity to make up bad grades by helping with homework, etc. Counselors should listen to my side of the story.

Some of the things the counselors tell you I know are wrong--like getting haircuts. I was in the protest last summer and since then they've been against me--especially the administration.

Counselors shouldn't violate students' rights.

They are not smart enough to handle kids.

We need more counselors.

Counselors shouldn't follow their training to the point of not understanding the kids.

It's up to the kid to change and not the counselor. He has to be a human being before his training will pay off. There seems to be a natural gift for helping people that some of us have and others don't.

---

Counselors should stop being one-sided. They take the teachers side too often. I've proved the teacher wrong on occasion and still have not benefited. Counselors could mediate more between students and teachers.

Counselors try to be over-helpful. I would like to leave some decisions about courses up to myself. I think I'm capable of deciding what I can and can't do. I work harder in things I like.

Teachers over-rule students, antagonize them, and step on their rights. Some teachers get a kick out of over-powering you. Counselors help you get along with teachers. Need more attention to students' rights.

Students don't always have enough faith in counseling to express their real problems to them.

## APPENDIX F

## COUNSELORS' PRIMARY COUNSELING OUTCOME SUCCESS AND FAILURE CRITERIA

### Counseling Success Criteria for Ideal Clients

| Criteria | Number |
|---|---|
| Exhibits maturity in planning future | 35 |
| Successful school adjustment | 31 |
| Improved study skills | 14 |
| Resolved self conflicts | 11 |
| Resloved conflicts with others | 6 |
| Good counseling relationship | 3 |
| | 100 |

### Counseling Failure Criteria for Non-preferred Clients

| Criteria | Number |
|---|---|
| Did not resolve conflicts with others | 27 |
| Did not improve study skills | 27 |
| Did not make successful school adjustment | 18 |
| Did not resolve self conflicts | 17 |
| Did not exhibit maturity in future planning | 7 |
| Did not experience a good counseling relationship | 4 |
| | 100 |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY OF RELATED LITERATURE

Abeles, N. Liking for clients--its relationship to therapist and personality and emphathic understanding. Paper presented at Am. Psychol. Assn., Los Angeles, 1964.

Becker, H. Social-class variations in teacher-pupil relationships. J. educ. Soc., 1952, 25, 452-462.

Bugental, J. The person who is the psychotherapist. J. consult. Psychol., 1964, 28, 272-277.

Callis, R. Diagnostic classification as a research tool. J. counsel. Psychol., 1965, 12, 238-243.

Carson, R. and Heine, R. Similarity and success in therapeutic dyads. J. consult. Psychol., 1962, 26, 38-43.

Cartwright, R. and Lerner, B. Empathy, need to change and improvement with psychotheraphy. J. consult. Psychol., 1963, 27, 138-144.

Corwin, R. and Thomas, S. The social context of vocational education and guidance. Guid. J., 1966, 5, 102-15.

Davis, A. Social class influence upon learning. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1948.

Deutsch, M. Minority group and class status as related to social and personality factors in scholastic achievement. Ithaca, New York: Society for Applied Anthropology, Monograph No. 2, 1960, 3-23.

Drews, E. The schools: climate affects fallout. In Daniel Schreiber (Ed.), Guidance and the school dropout. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association and American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1964.

Edwards, A. Statistical analysis. New York: Rhinehart and Company, 1959.

Ells, J. Therapists' views and preference concerning intake cases. J. consult. Psychol., 1964, 28, 382.

Feifel, H. and Ells, J. Patients and therapists assess the same psychotherapy. J. consult, Psychol., 1963, 27, 310-318.

Fiedler, F. The concept of an ideal therapeutic relationship. J. consult. Psychol., 1950, 14, 39-45.

Fiedler, F. Quantitative studies on the role of therapists' feelings toward their patients. In Mowrer, O. H. (Ed.), *Psychotherapy theory and research*, New York: Ronald Press, 1953.

Fiedler, F. and Senior, K. An exploratory study of unconscious feeling reactions in fifteen patient-therapist pairs. *J. abnorm. soc. Psychol.*, 1952, *47*, 446-453.

Frank, J. *Persuasion and healing: a comparative study of psychotherapy*, Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1961.

Friedenberg, E. *The vanishing adolescent*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1959.

Gliedman, L., Stone, A., Frank, J., Nash, E. and Imber, S. Incentives for treatment related to remaining or improving in psychotherapy. *Amer. J. Psychother.*, 1957, *11*, 589-598.

Goldstein, A. Therapist and client expectations of personality change in psychotherapy. *J. counsel. Psychol.*, 1960, *7*, 180-184.

Goldstein, A. *Therapist-patient expectancies in psychotherapy*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1962.

Goldstein, A. and Shipman, W. Patient's expectancies, symptom reduction, and aspects of the initial psychotherapeutic interview. *J. clin. Psychol.*, 1961, *17*, 129-133.

Haubrich, V. Teachers for big-city schools, in *Education in depressed areas*, ed. H. Passow. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, 246.

Heath, R. *The reasonable adventurer*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsbrugh Press, 1964.

Heine, R. and Trosman, H. Initial expectations of the doctor-patient interaction as a factor in continuance in psychotherapy. *Psychiat.*, 1960, *23*, 275-278.

Heller, K., Myers, R. and Kline, L. Interviewer behavior as a function of standardized client roles. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1963, *27*, 117-122.

Heller, K., Davis, J. and Myers, R. The effects of interviewer style in a standardized interview. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1966, *30*, 501-508.

Hollingshead, A. and Redlich, F. *Social class and mental illness*. New York: Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

Kahn, R. and Cannell, C. The dynamics of interviewing. New York: Wiley, 1957.

Kornberg, L. Meaningful teachers for alienated children, in Education in depressed areas, ed. H. Passow. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, 265-274.

Lamke, T. and Nelson, M. Manual: The Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Iowa State Teachers College, 1957.

Lichtenstein, E. Personality similarity and therapeutic success: a failure to replicate. J. consult. Psychol., 1966, 30, 282.

Lindquist, E. Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1953.

McNair, D., Lorr, M. and Callahan, D. Patient and therapist influences on quitting psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1963, 27, 10-17.

Mendelsohn, G. Effects of client personality and client-counselor similarity on the duration of counseling: a replication and extension. J. consult. Psychol., 1966, 13, 228-234.

Mendelsohn, G. and Geller, M. Structure of client attitudes toward counseling and their relation to client-counselor similarity. J. consult. Psychol., 1965, 29, 63-72.

Mills, D. and Abeles, N. Counselor needs for affiliation and nurturance as related to liking for clients and counseling process. J. counsel. Psychol., 1965, 12, 353-358.

Mood, A. Introduction to the theory of statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Myers, I. Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1962.

Myers, J. and Shaffer, L. Social stratification and psychiatric practice: a study of an outpatient clinic. Amer. soc. rev., 1954, 19, 307-310.

Passow, H. Diminishing teacher prejudice, in The inner-city classroom: teacher behaviors, ed., R. Strom. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Books, Inc., 1966, 93-109

Pepinsky, H. On the utility of bias in treatment. J. counsel. Psychol., 1963, 10, 402-405.

Reiff, R. Mental health manpower and institutional change. Amer. Psychol., 1966, 21, 540-548.

Riesman, D. Forward. In Health, R. The reasonable adventurer. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

Rocchio, P. and Kearney, N. Teacher-pupil attitudes as related to non-promotion of secondary school pupils. Educ. psychol. measmt., 1956, 16, 244-252.

Roe, A. The psychology of occupations. New York: Wiley, 1956.

Rogers, C. Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

Rogers, C. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1951.

Rogers, C. The interpersonal relationship: the core of guidance. Harvard educ. rev., 1962, 32, 416-429.

Rosenthal, R. and Fode, K. Three experiments in experimenter bias. Unpublished manuscript, 1960.

Schofield, W. Psychotherapy: the purchase of friendship. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Siegel, S. Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Snyder, W. The psychotherapy relationship. New York: Mac Millan, 1961.

Stendler, C. Children of Brasstown. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1949.

Stoler, N. Client likeability: a variable in the study of psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1963, 27, 175-178.

Stricker, L. and Ross, J. A description and evaluation of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. (Research Bulletin 62-6). Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1962.

Stricker, L. and Ross, J. The item content and some correlates of a Jungian personality inventory. (Research Bulletin 63-3). Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

Strom, R. (ed.) The inner-city classroom: teacher behaviors. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.

Strupp, H. The performance of psychiatrists and psychologists in a therapeutic interview. J. clin. Psychol., 1958, 14, 219-226.

Strupp, H. and William, J. Some determinants of clinical evaluations of different psychiatrists. A. M. A. Arch. gen psychiat., 1960, 2, 434-440.

Sullivan, H. Conceptions of modern psychiatry. New York: Norton, 1953.

Thompson, C. and Peters, H. Interest: The key dynamism in the counseling process. The Sch. Counsel., 1966, 14, 86-89.

Toby, J. Orientation to education as a factor in the school maladjustment of lower class children. Social Forces, 1957, 35, 254-266.

Truax C. Some implications of behavior therapy for psychotherapy. J. counsel. Psychol., 1966, 13, 160-168.

Truax C., Wargo, D., Frank, J., Imber, S., Battle, C., Hoehn-Saric, R., Nash, E. and Stone, A. Therapist empathy, genuiness, and warmth and patient therapeutic outcome. J. counsel Psychol., 1966, 30, 395-401.

Tyler, L. The work of the counselor. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, Inc., 1961.

van der Veen, F. Effects on the therapist and the patient on each other's therapeutic behavior. J. consult. Psychol., 1965, 29, 19-26.

van der Veen, F. Basic elements in the process of psychotherapy: a research study. J. consult. Psychol., 1967, 31, 295-303.

Wallach, M. and Strupp, H. Psychotherapists' clinical judgments and attitudes toward patients. J. consult Psychol., 1960, 24, 316-323.

Warner, E., Havinghurst, R. and Loeb, M. Who shall be educated? New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1944.

Waskow, I. Counselor attitudes and client behavior. J. consult. Psychol., 1963, 27, 405-412.

Welkowitz, J., Cohen, J. and Ortmeyer, D. Value system similarity: investigation of patient-therapist dyads. J. consult. Psychol., 1967, 31, 48-55.

Wolberg, L. The technique of psychotherapy. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1954.

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

# ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACCESSION NO.

CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER

RESUME DATE — —

P.A.

T.A.

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☐

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☐

TITLE

Counselors' Conceptions of Ideal and Non-preferred Client Types

PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)

Thompson, Charles Lowell

INSTITUTION (SOURCE)

SOURCE CODE

REPORT/SERIES NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

PUB'L. DATE December-1967

CONTRACT/GRANT NUMBER OEG-1-7-070072-3717

PAGINATION, ETC.

131 + vii pages

RETRIEVAL TERMS

Counselors' Conceptions of Client Idealness
Counselor Bias
Counseling Outcomes
Relationship of Client Preference to Counseling Outcome
Effects of Counselor and Client Expectations on Counseling Outcomes
Communication of Counselor Expectations

IDENTIFIERS

ABSTRACT

Characteristics of school counselors' ideal and non-preferred clients were studied for their differential effects on client idealness. The following factors were examined in relationship to client idealness: (1) Client-counselor personality similarity; (2) Counselors' and clients' judgments of the counselor's effectiveness; (3) Counselor-client agreement on counseling outcome ratings, nature of the problem, and cause of the problem; and (4) Client traits.

Ideal clients were found to be more similar to their counselors than non-preferred clients on the Extroversion-Introversion and Judgment-Perception Scales of the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Counselor-client agreement on outcome ratings and problem cause was significantly greater for ideal clients as were their ratings of the counselor's effectiveness. Client idealness was found to be related to: (1) Higher G.P.A.'s and intelligence test scores; (2) Plans to attend college; (3) Female clients (in the case of male counselo (4) Parents' occupations; (5) Problem type; and (6) Problem cause.

OE 6000 (Rev. 9-66)

# INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING ERIC REPORT RESUME

**The resume is used to identify summary data and information about each document acquired, processed, and stored within the ERIC system. In addition to serving as a permanent record of the document in the collection, the resume is also a means of dissemination. All fields of the form must be completed in the allotted spaces, but inapplicable fields should be left blank. The following instructions are keyed to the line numbers appearing in the left margin of the form:**

**TOP LINE.** ERIC Accession No. Leave blank. A permanent ED number will be assigned to each resume and its corresponding document as they are processed into the ERIC system.

**LINE 001.** Clearinghouse Accession No. For use only by ERIC Clearinghouses. Enter the alpha code and 6-digit document number.

Resume Date. In numeric form, enter month, day, and year that resume is completed. *(Example: 07 14 66)*

P.A. Leave blank.

T.A. Leave blank.

Copyright. Check appropriate block to denote presence of copyrighted material within the document.

ERIC Reproduction Release. Check appropriate block to indicate that ERIC has permission to reproduce the document and its resume form.

**LINES 100–103.** Title. Enter the complete document title, including subtitles if they add significant information. Where applicable, also enter volume number or part number, and the type of document *(Final Report, Interim Report, Thesis, etc.)*.

**LINE 200.** Personal Author(s). Enter personal author(s), last name first. *(Example: Doe, John J.)* If two authors are given, enter both. *(Example: Doe, John J. Smith, Ted)*. If there are three or more authors, list only one followed by "and others."

**LINE 300.** Institution *(Source)*. Enter the name of the organization which originated the report. Include the address *(city and State)* and the subordinate unit of the organization. *(Example: Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass., School of Education.)*

Source Code. Leave blank.

**LINE 310.** Report/Series No. Enter any unique number assigned to the document by the institutional source. *(Example: SC-1234)*

**LINE 320.** Other Source. Use only when a second source is associated with the document. Follow instructions for Line 300 above.

Source Code. Leave blank.

**LINE 330.** Other Report No. Enter document number assigned by the second source.

**LINE 340.** Other Source. Use only when a third source is associated with the document. Follow instructions for Line 300 above.

Source Code. Leave blank.

**LINE 350.** Other Report No. Enter document number assigned by the third source.

**LINE 400.** Publication Date. Enter the day, month, and year of the document. *(Example: 12 Jun 66)*

Contract/Grant Number. Applicable only for documents generated from research sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. Enter appropriate contract or grant number and its prefix. *(Example: OEC-1-6-061234-0033)*

**LINES 500–501.** Pagination, etc. Enter the total number of pages of the document, including illustrations and appendixes. *(Example: 115p.)* USE THIS SPACE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTINENT TO THE DOCUMENT, such as publisher, journal citation, and other contract numbers.

**LINES 600–606.** Retrieval Terms. Enter the important subject terms *(descriptors)* which, taken as a group, adequately describe the contents of the document.

**LINE 607.** Identifiers. Enter any additional important terms, more specific than descriptors, such as trade names, equipment model names and numbers, organization and project names, discussed in the document.

**LINES 800–822.** Abstract. Enter an informative abstract of the document. Its style and content must be suitable for public announcement and dissemination.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1966 O—231-551